



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/39192403100217>



Ontario
Ministry of
Labour

Ontario
Manpower
Commission

Government
Publications

LABOUR MARKET INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

CA24N
L 100
-82E56

EMPLOYMENT AND THE PHYSICALLY
HANDICAPPED IN ONTARIO

A publication of
**The Ontario
Manpower
Commission**





CA224N
L 100
- 82E56

EMPLOYMENT AND THE PHYSICALLY

HANDICAPPED IN ONTARIO

ONTARIO MANPOWER COMMISSION

SECRETARIAT

JANUARY, 1982.

***Disability:** is defined in terms of the effects of conditions or impairments on an individual's ability to perform normal daily activities ("over the long term"). It is used to describe the loss or reduction of functional ability and activity that is consequent upon impairment.

Impairment: describes any disturbance of or interference with the normal structure and function of the body.

World Health Organization

PROLOGUE

Physical impairment may be observed to extend along a continuum ranging from impairment (without limitation) to impairment with functional limitation i.e. disability.*

The data contained in this report was derived from The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario, a study prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Health. Respondents providing information universally manifest physical impairment with an accompanying degree of functional limitation.

Persons experiencing physical impairments not interfering in the course of daily activity (i.e. the impaired/not handicapped) were not sampled beyond the process of determining a rudimentary demographic profile. The size of the "impaired/not handicapped" population, and the age characteristics of its constituents, is presented in Appendix II, Table 1 -- as is the size of Ontario's physically handicapped community.

5.4% of Ontario's population is physically handicapped. Another 4.5% experience impairment without disability. 4.7% and 3.9%, respectively, of the working age population are similarly affected. Due to a loose definition of impairment, statistics pertaining to this group should be approached with caution. In any event, in keeping with Provincial policy to provide services to those most in need, this paper focusses on the characteristics and identified employment-related needs of Ontario's physically handicapped population.

*Disability: is defined in terms of the effects of conditions or impairments on an individual's ability to perform normal daily activities ('over the long term'). It is used to describe the loss or reduction of functional ability and activity that is consequent upon impairment.

Impairment: describes any disturbance of or interference with the normal structure and function of the body.

World Health Organization

NOTE:

The Statistics reported in this paper were derived from the original data tape compiled as a product of a study commissioned by the Ministry of Health. Subsequent to the analyses herein presented, an audit -- resulting in minor modifications to the data was performed. Consequently, certain of the percentages reported in this document may have shifted slightly. Trends, however, are expected to remain constant.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An investigation of the general dimensions of employment within Ontario's handicapped community has determined that:

- o The handicapped labour force consists of 160,544 persons. (The working-age population numbers 257,971).
- o Although participation rates for disabled and non-disabled populations do not differ appreciably (62.2% vs. 66.8%), levels of unemployment do. In 1980, the larger labour force experienced an unemployment rate of 6.9% while the disabled recorded a rate of 29.7%.

The finding that aggregate participation rates associated with the physically disabled and the non-disabled are similar indicates that comparable proportions of persons in both groups voluntarily opt out of labour force activity.

In contrast to the larger labour force it is evident that handicapped workers in all occupational sectors face greater prospects of unemployment. Still, within the physically disabled labour force, a substantial number of people (70.3%) are employed. In answer to the question: 'what factors distinguish the employed disabled from the unemployed disabled?', it was found that:

- o Youth and sex (female) negatively influence employment status;
- o The employed were more likely to have pursued their education further than the unemployed;
- o The employed were less likely to have discontinued their education for health-related reasons;
- o Community type (urban or rural) did not influence employment status;
- o The absence of previous work experience was not widespread among the unemployed (only 6.4% lack such experience) -- making this a significant factor to very few (3,100 persons).

Duration of unemployment statistics suggest the presence of severe unemployment. Eighty percent of unemployed disabled workers have been jobless for upward of 26 weeks. This is twice the average length of time spent without a job in the larger labour force. Extended unemployment may be reflective of:

- o persistent barriers;
- o the economic climate;
- o age;
- o the actual employment potential of an individual;
- o actual interest in securing employment.

Labour force performance patterns were observed to differ by disability group. Indeed, disparate levels of unemployment suggest the presence of varied job-related needs.

As previously noted, the highest level of unemployment within the entire handicapped labour force is experienced by the youth group yet only three disability groups find more than fifteen percent of their constituents in this age category (respiratory -- 19.2%, sight impaired -- 18.6%, and neurological 16.6%). For four groups, five percent or less of constituents are drawn from this age class (cardiovascular -- 1.2%, neoplasm -- 1.9%, endo-meta-nutr. -- 3.8%, musculoskeletal -- 5.5%). In contrast to the 25-44 year age group, persons between 45 and 65 experienced a higher unemployment rate. With respect to each disability group often substantially greater than 48.0% of individuals fall into the older class. Having observed the statistics on previous work experience, it would be reasonable to assume that most of these individuals have exhibited a prior labour force attachment.

A disaggregation of the older group further reveals that, for six groups, over forty percent of constituents fall between 55-65 years. These groups are: neoplasm (64.8%), cardiovascular (64.4%), sight impaired (50.4%), hearing impaired (45.3%), endo-meta-nutr. (44.9%), and respiratory (41.0%).

With regard to part-time vs. full-time employment, two intervening variables preclude making the assumption that disability type acts on basis of employment. They are age and sex. Each of the disability groups cited in the preceeding paragraph are predominantly older. Earlier findings indicated that the incidence of part-time employment increases with age and is higher among women.

Two-thirds of the unemployed disabled expressed an interest in immediate employment. Interest in employment was keenest within the 15-24 year age group and declined steadily with increasing age. An exploration of interest by disability group reveals that: (i) levels of interest varied; (ii) unemployment rates for certain groups (neoplasm and alimentary) may be overstated.

Slightly over 13,000 of the unemployed felt that job training could enable them to find employment. Almost two-thirds of the unemployed group declined the suggestion -- the majority citing health problems as preventing them from pursuing training. Manual skills training was the preferred option while training in job seeking skills ranked a distant second. Level of interest in training roughly parallels level of interest in employment when age categories are examined.

Within the larger handicapped community, direct and indirect employment-related needs ranked low in the needs hierarchy. Their placement may be expected to rise if considered with respect to labour force participants only.

Positive employer attitudes and government support efforts were not widely credited with facilitating employment. Most employed persons expressed a reliance on their own skills and abilities.

A variety of factors -- economic, attitudinal, personal and disability specific, interact to affect:

- o available employment opportunities;
- o the ability of handicapped workers to take advantage of available opportunities;
- o the level of unemployment experienced by the physically handicapped.

While an economic upturn may result in increased job opportunities and lower levels of unemployment generally, certain segments of the disabled labour force (due to logistical barriers, inadequate preparation, or negative attitudes directed toward disability) will continue to face difficulty in gaining or maintaining employment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	(i) - (iii)
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
PART I - General Dimensions of the Handicapped Population	2
1.1 Disability Profile	3 - 4
1.2 Summary	5
2. General Dimensions of Handicapped Employment	6
2.1 Employment Status Profile	6
2.2 Employment Status by Occupation	6
2.3 Employment Status by Age	7
2.4 Employment Status by Sex	7
2.5 Employment Status by Educational Level	8
2.6 Employment Status by Community Type	8
2.7 Previous Work Experience	9
2.8 Duration of Unemployment	9
2.9 Full-Time vs. Part-Time Employment	9
2.10 Employment Status by Personal Income	10
2.11 Summary	11 - 12
3. Labour Force Activity by Disability Group	13
3.1 Employment Status Profile	13
3.2 Disability Group by Age	14
3.3 Full-Time vs Part-Time Employment by Disability Group	14
3.4 Summary	15

4.	Demand For Employment or Employment-Related Services	
4.1	Extent of Interest in Employment Among the Unemployed	16
4.2	Interest in Job Training and Type of Job Training Requested	17
4.3	Major Areas of Need as Identified by the Physically Handicapped Community	18
4.4	Job Placement and the Employed	18
4.5	Summary	18
PART I - Footnotes		19 - 20
PART II - Factors Affecting Handicapped Employment		
1.	Job Barriers	21
1.1	Employer Attitudes	21
1.2	Work-site Architectural Barriers	21
1.3	Transportation	22
2.	Level of Aggregate Demand	23
3.	Worker Substitution	23
4.	Wage Fixing, Wage Permits	24
5.	Preparation for Labour Market Entry	24
6.	Summary	25
Part II - Footnotes		26
PART III - Handicapped Employment Outlook, 1981-1986		
1.	Demographic Outlook - General Dimensions of the Physically Handicapped Community	27
2.	Occupational Areas	28
3.	Economic Conditions	28

	<u>Page</u>
4. The Impact of Technology	29
4.1 Job Opportunities	29
4.2 Displacement	29
4.3 Specialized Technology	29
5. Education and Special Training Needs	30 - 31
6. Summary	31
Part III - Footnotes	32
<u>CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS</u>	34

Appendices

- I. Impairment Classification
- II. Charts and Tables

Bibliography

Index

Tables Pertinent to Part I: Section I

Table

1	Household Survey: Age Breakdown
2	Gender and Age Distributions
3	Educational Level
4	Marital Status and Sex
5	Relationship to Head of Household
6	Personal Income
7	Other (Family) Income
8	Regional Distribution of the Handicapped in Ontario
9	Rural/Urban Distribution
10	Cause of Impairment
11	Disability in Order of Prevalence
12	Primary Disability Group and Cause of Impairment
13	Number of Medical Impairments per Respondent
14	Number of Functional Limitations
15	Respondent Perception of Degree of Disability

Tables Pertinent to Part I: Section 2

16	Comparative Labour Force Statistics, Ontario: Disabled and Non-Disabled Communities
17	Employment Status by Occupation
18	Comparative Unemployment Rates by Occupation, Ontario: Disabled and Non-Disabled Labour Forces
19	Employment Status by Age and Sex
20	Employment and Participation Statistics by Age Class (Males)
21	Employment and Participation Statistics by Age Class (Females)
22	Employment and Participation Statistics by Age Class, Total (Males and Females)
23	Comparative Labour Force Statistics, Ontario: Disabled and Non-Disabled Youth (15-24)
24	Comparative Labour Force Statistics - Adults (25+)
25	Comparative Labour Force Statistics - Males
26	Comparative Labour Force Statistics - Females
27	Comparative Labour Force Statistics - Adult Men (25+)
28	Comparative Labour Force Statistics - Adult Women (25+)
29	Employment Status by Educational Attainment
30	Educational Attainment and Employment Status, Ontario, 1980 Annual Averages
31	Unemployment Rates by Educational Attainment for Disabled and Non-Disabled Groups
32	Employment Status by Reason did not continue Education
33	Employment Status by Community Type
34	Previous Employment Among the Unemployed

Table

35	Length of Time Unemployed for Unemployed Handicapped
36	Average Duration of Unemployment, Ontario: 1979 and 1980
37	Full-Time and Part-Time Employment by Age and Sex, Ontario: Annual Averages 1980
38	Employment Status by Personal Income
39	Personal Income by Full-Time Employment and Age Group
40	Personal Income by Part-Time Employment and Age Group
41	Personal Income Among the Unemployed by Age Group
42	Type of Income by Employment Status
43	Sources of Income by Employment Status

Tables Pertinent to Part I: Section 3

44	Employment and Participation Statistics by Disability Group
45	Percentage Point Differences Between Disability Group and General Population Employment and Participation Statistics, 1980
46	Disability Group by Age for All Handicapped Persons Between 15-65
47	Disability Group by Employment Status
48	Disability Group by Employment Status of Employed Labour Force (Percentages)
49	Degree of Dependency Scale Broken Down by Employment Status

Tables Pertinent to Part I: Section 4

50	Primary Disability Group by Interest in a Job Among the Unemployed
51	Age Group by Interest in a Job Among the Unemployed
52	Job Training Desired Among the Unemployed
53	Type of Job Training Requested
54	Requests for Further Training by Age
55	Primary Disability Group by Want Further Training
56	Reason Job Training Not Wanted
57	Employment Status by Type of Further Training Desired
58	Major Need Areas of the Handicapped Ranked
59	Employment Status by What Helped to Get Last Job

Tables Pertinent to Part II

60	Asked to Leave a Job and Impairment Classification
----	--

Table

Tables Pertinent to Part III

61	Estimated Growth in the Provincial Disabled Population
62	Estimated Growth in the Disabled Labour Force
63	Employment Status by Need for Special Training

INTRODUCTION

The handicapped community is heterogeneous in nature consisting of those who are physically handicapped, developmentally handicapped and psychiatrically disabled. Due to the differing issues and concerns associated with these varied subgroups, it was decided to examine each separately. This is the paper on the physically disabled. It has been prepared by the Secretariat of the Ontario Manpower Commission and consists of three parts:

- PART I quantifies handicapped unemployment in Ontario as well as identifying characteristics of the unemployed disabled;
- PART II discusses factors contributing to handicapped unemployment;
- PART III engages in a projection of the employment situation over the next five years with regard to this group.

The Commission gratefully acknowledges the assistance provided by the Office of the Co-ordinator of Rehabilitation Services, and the Provincial Steering Committee on Employment and the Disabled which consists of representatives from the Ministries of: Health; Community and Social Services; Labour; the Secretariat for Social Development; and the Workmen's Compensation Board.

GENERAL DIMENSIONS OF THE HANDICAPPED POPULATION

Approximately five percent of Ontario's non-institutionalized population is physically disabled. This figure represents 456,000 persons.¹

A snapshot of the group reveals that it is an aging population -- greater than 80% of disabled persons are forty-one 'plus' years old. Approximately eleven percent fall between the ages of 20 and 40 while 7.2% are nineteen and under.

The group is predominantly female. Women constitute the majority (54.2%) of the handicapped population. The Ontario Ministry of Health attributes this to their greater longevity.

A review of other demographic variables reveals the following:

Education

Approximately 11% of disabled persons have pursued a post-secondary education. Twenty-one percent have completed secondary school (including technical-trade schools) while 67.0% possess less than a completed high school education.² This may be due partially to the combined effects of:

- o young people currently moving through the educational system;
- o a pre-eminence of older persons educated during a time when less emphasis was placed on advanced education.

Marital Status

In Ontario, almost two-thirds of handicapped people are married. Sixteen percent have been widowed while 14% are, and have always been, single.

Half of all disabled persons identify themselves as heads of households. Another 32% registered spousal status while 10% are offspring in relation to their heads of households. Thus, 42% of disabled persons who are not themselves heads of households live within a traditional nuclear family arrangement.

Only 14% of the handicapped population live alone.

Income

Twenty percent of the handicapped exist without an identified personal income. Sixty-seven percent earn less than \$15,000 per annum while 11.2% earn between \$15-30,000 per year. When total family income is taken into consideration, the percentage of individuals with (combined) incomes of \$15,000 or less declines to 47.7%. Correspondingly the proportion with incomes of \$15-30,000 rises.³

Regional Distribution

Regional distribution of handicapped persons in Ontario parallels general population concentrations. The largest group is located in central Ontario followed by groups residing in the western region, the southern region, the eastern region and the north. Urban addresses may be associated with 68% of the handicapped community while the remainder live in rural locales.

1.1 Disability Profile

Not all physical impairments are readily visible. Half of the handicapped population is disabled as a result of 'invisible' impairments.

Within the physically disabled community, several distinct subgroups emerge.

Ten aggregate categories of disability -- each encompassing varied specific impairments or conditions -- have been identified by the Ministry of Health. In order of prevalence these categories are:

- o Musculo-skeletal -- e.g. rheumatoid and degenerative arthritis, orthopaedic limbs, spina bifida, skin disorders, congenital anomalies;
- o Cardiovascular/Arteriovascular -- e.g. congenital and acquired disorders, hypertension;
- o Hearing Impairments;
- o Neurological including impairments from epilepsy, CP, and polio to brain damage;
- o Respiratory -- e.g. cystic fibrosis, emphysema;
- o Alimentary -- e.g. digestive disorders, urogenital;
- o Endocrine/Metabolic/Nutritional including conditions from diabetes to all gland diseases;
- o Sight Impairment -- total and partial impairments;
- o Neoplasm -- including all cancers;
- o Speech Impairment.⁴

Etiology varies. Illness and hereditary factors have been cited as the leading causes of disability followed by work accident, environmental causes, birth defects and aging. Onset categories where men outnumber women are work accident, travel accident (72.3% vs. 27.7% and 56.7% vs. 43.6% respectively) and environmental causes (9.4% vs. 6.4%).

Various functional limitations may accompany disability. Sixty-four percent of handicapped Ontarians face two or more functional limitations. Age intervenes -- older persons are more likely to possess several limitations.

Certain conditions aggregate to different age groups. Individuals 0-19 years most often have problems associated with musculoskeletal, hearing, speech and heart and lung impairments while those in the 40-64 age range most often experience problems with spin-trunk, multiple skeletal conditions, internal organs and peripheral vascular systems.

Also, certain limitations are more typical of one or the other sex. Musculoskeletal, multiple problems and internal organ problems exhibit a higher frequency of occurrence among females whereas hearing difficulties and heart-lung problems are more prevalent among males.⁵

1.2 SUMMARY

Highlights from the Ontario Ministry of Health disclose that:

- o 5% (456,000 persons) of Ontario's population experiences physical handicaps to the extent that disability interferes with the course of daily activity⁶
- o 80% of disabled persons are over forty years of age. Correspondingly, illness and aging are leading causes of disability. Due to their greater longevity, women are in the majority.
- o 67% of handicapped persons report a personal income of less than \$15,000 per annum. Another 20% report no income at all.
- o Half of all disabled persons are heads of households while another 42%, as either spouses or progeny, live within a traditional nuclear family arrangement.
- o Most (67%) physically handicapped persons possess less than a completed secondary school education.
- o The handicapped community is, in itself, heterogeneous. Ten disability categories emerge. The three most prevalent disability groups are: musculoskeletal, cardiovascular, and hearing impairment. 56% of persons experience multiple impairment. Not all physical handicaps are readily visible. Half of the disabled population is disabled as a result of 'invisible' impairments.

Two observations are striking in their implications for the development of employment policies for the physically disabled. First, the handicapped population is an older group. Second, the physically handicapped population is heterogeneous virtually predicting varied patterns of unemployment and employment related needs.

GENERAL DIMENSIONS OF HANDICAPPED EMPLOYMENT

2.1 Employment Status

In Ontario, the working-age physically handicapped population numbers 257,971. The labour force as a sub-population of this group consists of 160,544 persons thus resulting in a labour force participation rate of 62.2%.⁷ Interestingly, this rate does not vary significantly from the non-disabled population (66.8% in 1980) indicating that a similar percentage of both groups voluntarily remain outside of the labour force.

Unemployment rates, however, are in dramatic contrast. While the larger labour force experienced an annual average unemployment rate of 6.9% in 1980, the unemployment rate for the physically disabled stands at 29.7%.⁸

2.2 Employment Status by Occupation

The handicapped labour force disaggregates by the following occupational categories: clerical, sales, service, farming-fishing-mining, manual labour, semi and skilled trades, transportation, supervisory, teaching, scientific-technical, social and artistic, executive-managerial, other.

Greatest proportions of the total unemployed were found in the clerical, manual labour, and semi and skilled trade sectors. Smallest proportions were located in the farming-fishing-mining, and executive-managerial occupations. These findings roughly correspond with frequency distributions, i.e. attachments to clerical occupations command the greatest share of the handicapped labour force while the farming-fishing-mining sectors command among the lowest.

A review of each sector reveals that persons associated with the transportation sector (followed by those in manual labour and teaching) experience the highest rate of unemployment (44.7%). Executive-managerial and social-artistic personnel experience the lowest levels of unemployment of all occupational categories.

Only selective comparisons to the larger population are possible due to the use of incompatible categories. Compatible categories are: managerial, teaching, clerical, sales, service, and transportation. In every instance unemployment rates displayed by handicapped workers substantially exceed the rates exhibited by the larger (Canadian) labour force.

2.3 Employment Status by Age

Three age categories, for both disabled and non-disabled populations, have been reviewed: 15-24 years, 25-44 years, and 45-64 years.

Two observations are immediately noteworthy:

- (i) unemployment rates are highest in association with the youth group. (The finding that the young disabled experience higher levels of joblessness parallels circumstances among the larger labour force);
- (ii) in each case unemployment levels are greater among the disabled than the non-disabled.

Participation rates are greatest for the 25-44 group replicating the pattern established within the larger population . It is of interest to observe and compare changes in participation rates between the 25-44 and 45-64 age categories for both disabled and non-disabled populations. Whereas the non-disabled participation rate declines by approximately 14% between the two age groups, the rate displayed by the older disabled group represents a decline of 30% indicating the greater presence of a diminished interest in employment among older physically handicapped workers than that exhibited generally.

2.4 Employment Status by Sex

In contrast to their male counterparts, handicapped women experience higher rates of unemployment in sum (27.1% vs. 38.3%) and in all age categories. Further, employed males outnumber employed females 2 to 1. Employment per capita is comparable between the sexes only when the 15-24 year age groups are noted.

Lower participation rates for the female group replicate general labour force trends (males -- 71.9%; females 43.1%) although the spread between the sexes in the general labour force is not as pronounced (79.9% to 54.3%).

With one exception (i.e. a greater rate of unemployment among young non-disabled males when compared to their female counterparts) differences between handicapped men and women, with regard to employment status, parallel notable patterns demonstrated by the larger labour force.

2.5 Employment Status and Educational Level

Drawing from the experience of the larger labour force where levels of unemployment decline as educational attainment increases, it may have been speculated that the employed disabled would most likely have obtained a higher level of education than the unemployed.⁹ This concept is substantiated,¹⁰ although contrary to general tendencies, attendance at a community college enjoys a stronger positive correlation with employment than attendance at a university. Disabled community college graduates experience a 12.6% unemployment rate whereas university graduates display a 26.3% unemployment rate. Graduates of technical or trade programs also experience a high rate of joblessness (24.7%) as do persons who possess a completed secondary school education (32.7%).

Those remaining outside the labour force were found to have the lowest representation of people who have completed some level of university education.

In an attempt to explore the possible relationship between disability and interaction with the external environment, reasons indicated for discontinuation of education and how this relates to employment status were examined.

For both employed and unemployed groups, non-health related reasons (e.g. goal achieved) predominate. Furthermore, barriers such as problems in getting to the educational institution, physical structure of the building were not major reasons for the discontinuation of education. However, among the unemployed, 6.3% reported health problems as the main reason for not continuing compared to 3.6% of the employed.

2.6 Employment Status and Community Type

There is little difference between urban and rural community locales with respect to the employment status and proportions of people remaining outside of the labour force. Percentages of employed and unemployed are slightly greater in urban locations while the proportion of non-participants in the labour force is slightly greater in rural communities.

2.7 Previous Work Experience

The majority (93.6%) of the unemployed disabled have, at some time, been employed. Only 6.4% or 3,100 persons do not possess employment related experience. This number of persons represents 2.0% of the total handicapped labour force.

A possibly low estimate of work experience among non-participants in the labour force would be the notation of those who report themselves to be retired. 164,300 handicapped persons have identified themselves as retired from the labour force.¹¹ This figure represents 53.0% of the 'other' group or 36.0% of the entire handicapped population.

2.8 Duration of Unemployment

The average length of unemployment experienced among the non-disabled during 1980 was 13.9 weeks. Thirty-two percent of the unemployed remained jobless for more than fourteen weeks.

In comparison, 80.2% of unemployed disabled persons have been jobless for upward of 26 weeks (6 months) or twice as long as the average duration experienced by the non-disabled. Nearly one quarter of the jobless handicapped have been unemployed for seven or more years.

2.9 Full-Time vs. Part-Time Employment

19.4% of the handicapped labour force, or 27.8% of those employed, work on a part-time basis. Conversely, 50.9% of the same labour force, or 72.2% of the employed, work full-time.

When compared to the larger labour force it is evident that more disabled persons per capita are employed part-time than non-disabled persons (13.1% of the larger labour force or 14.0% of those working).

One striking difference between the sexes is that there are relatively few males employed part-time through the most productive years (more are employed full-time), whereas a significant proportion of females do work part-time during this period. This tendency replicates general labour force patterns.

Both sexes show a high proportion of part-time workers below 25 (also immitating general trends) and over 50. Lower full-time employment levels are noticeable with regard to these age groups. While present, these trends are less pronounced within the male group.

2.10 Employment Status by Personal Income

As may be expected, a greater percentage of the unemployed (81.0%) than the employed (35.1%) receive incomes under \$10,000.00 per annum. Conversely, a greater percentage of the employed (64.9%) than the unemployed (18.9%) earn more than \$10,000.00 per year. Again according to expectation, more persons employed on a full-time basis are located in higher income brackets than their part-time counterparts. Men tend to earn higher wages than women.

Twenty-four percent of the unemployed report no income at all. Almost three times as many women (to men) identify with this circumstance. Interestingly, 1.1% of employed individuals also declare an absence of income.

Constituents of the handicapped labour force may receive income from one or more of four sources: wages or self-employment; other personal; public assistance; private insurance. Most (88.5%) report some earnings from wages or self-employment. A substantial proportion (50.8%) receive public assistance while 10.6% are recipients of private insurance benefits. Slightly more than one-third also draw from other sources of personal income.

Of the unemployed receiving public assistance, 50% receive more than one type of benefit. Eighteen percent of persons employed part-time and 15% of those employed full-time also receive two or more kinds of public assistance.

On average, individuals employed on a full-time basis draw income from 1.91 sources. Those employed part-time average 2.31 sources and the unemployed indicated a reliance on 2.35 sources of income.

2.11 SUMMARY

An investigation of the general dimensions of employment within Ontario's handicapped community has determined that:

- o The handicapped labour force consists of 160,544 persons. (The working-age population numbers 257,971).
- o Although participation rates for disabled and non-disabled populations do not differ appreciably (62.2% vs. 66.8%), levels of unemployment do. In 1980, the larger labour force experienced an unemployment rate of 6.9% while the disabled recorded a rate of 29.7%.

The finding that aggregate participation rates associated with the physically disabled and the non-disabled are similar indicates that comparable proportions of persons in both groups voluntarily opt out of labour force activity.

In contrast to the larger labour force it is evident that handicapped workers in all occupational sectors face greater prospects of unemployment. Still, within the physically disabled labour force, a substantial number of people (70.3%) are employed. In answer to the question: 'what factors distinguish the employed disabled from the unemployed disabled?', it was found that:

- o Youth and sex (female) negatively influence employment status;
- o The employed were more likely to have pursued their education further than the unemployed;
- o The employed were less likely to have discontinued their education for health-related reasons;
- o Community type (urban or rural) did not influence employment status;
- o The absence of previous work experience was not widespread among the unemployed (only 6.4% lack such experience) -- making this a significant factor to very few (3,100 persons).

Duration of unemployment statistics suggest the presence of severe unemployment. Eighty percent of unemployed disabled workers have been jobless for upward of 26 weeks. This is twice the average length of time spent without a job in the larger labour force. Extended unemployment may be reflective of:

- o persistent barriers;
- o the economic climate;
- o age;
- o the actual employment potential of an individual;
- o actual interest in securing employment.

Previously observed tendencies regarding the relationship between age, sex, education, and employment status parallel those exhibited by the labour force generally. Another occasion where patterns are replicated involves the incidence of part-time employment with respect to certain sub-populations (i.e. males 15-24 years and female age categories). Comparable levels of employment on a part-time basis are actually recorded.

An aggregate overview of employment on a full or part-time basis does disclose however that more physically disabled workers are employed on a part-time basis than non-disabled workers (19.4% vs. 13.1% respectively). The difference may be indicative of the extent of under-employment or it may reflect:

- (i) personal preference/convenience
- (ii) realistic limitations imposed by disability

While not surprising to note that the employed are in a better income position than the unemployed, it is interesting to observe that 15% of the full-time employed and 18% of the part-time employed are also in receipt of two or more kinds of public assistance. Further, 22% of persons within the handicapped labour force reporting income from wages or self-employment also indicate that they are unemployed.

3. LABOUR FORCE ACTIVITY BY DISABILITY GROUP

3.1 Employment Status Profile

As previously listed, ten aggregate categories of disability have been identified by the Ministry of Health. Congruent with disability group size, the musculoskeletal and cardiovascular groups maintain the largest labour forces. They are followed (not in order of prevalence) by those with neurological disabilities, endo-meta-nutr. disorders, alimentary problems, sight impairments, neoplasms, and speech impairments.¹² In every instance, significant numbers of working-age persons remain outside of the labour force.

The heterogeneity of the physically handicapped community virtually predicts diverse labour force performance patterns on the basis of disability type. Statistical evidence confirms prediction. In descending order of magnitude unemployment rates by disability group are: neoplasm¹³ (70.4%); respiratory (44.2%); musculoskeletal (32.9%); neurological (31.0%); alimentary (30.2%); sight impaired (24.8%); cardiovascular (24.5%); endo-meta-nutr. (18.1%); hearing impaired (17.6%) -- the last four groups falling below the overall handicapped unemployment rate (29.7%).

A glance at participation rates reveals that only three groups (alimentary, respiratory and musculoskeletal) register levels of participation above the aggregate handicapped rate (62.2%).¹⁴ Sight and hearing impaired groups exhibited rates some fifteen percentage points below this level meaning that proportionately fewer of the constituents of these two groups are involved in labour force activity.

The participation rate (72.9%) associated with those with musculoskeletal disorders exceeds that recorded by the non-disabled (66.8%). Other groups where the two rates vary by less than ten percent are: respiratory (62.1%); alimentary (61.7%); neurological (58.3%); and endo-meta-nutr. (58.1%).

Unemployment rates for each group surpass the level (6.9%) recorded by the Ontario labour force in 1980. Four groups come within twenty percentage points of that level (hearing impaired (+10.7%), endo-meta-nutr. (+11.2%), cardiovascular (+17.6%), and musculoskeletal (+17.9%), while the remaining groups surpass the 6.9% level by greater than twenty percentage points.

3.2 Disability Group by Age

In most cases a substantial constituency of persons (i.e. 25%) may be observed to be between the ages of 15 and 45. The two groups where this is not the case are the cardiovascular and neoplasm groups. By the same token, in every instance (but for the neurological disability group) greater than fifty percent of constituents are between 45 and 65 years of age.¹⁵

3.3 Full-Time vs. Part-Time Employment by Disability Group

Available data was examined with respect to disability type and full-time versus part-time employment. With respect to employed persons, two groups displayed an incidence of part-time employment which far surpassed the aggregate level of 28%. These groups were: respiratory (48.6%); and endo-meta-nutr. (40.5%).

3.4 SUMMARY

Labour force performance patterns were observed to differ by disability group. Indeed, disparate levels of unemployment suggest the presence of varied job-related needs.

Age distributions by disability group were discussed. Unfortunately a three-way cross-tabulation with employment status was not possible. It is, however, interesting to comment upon age for reasons of need prioritization. As previously noted, the highest level of unemployment within the entire handicapped labour force is experienced by the youth group yet only three disability groups find more than fifteen percent of their constituents in this age category (respiratory -- 19.2%, sight impaired -- 18.6%, and neurological 16.6%). For four groups, five percent or less of constituents are drawn from this age class (cardiovascular -- 1.2%, neoplasm -- 1.9%, endo-meta-nutr. -- 3.8%, musculoskeletal -- 5.5%). In contrast to the 25-44 year age group, persons between 45 and 65 experienced a higher unemployment rate. With respect to each disability group often substantially greater than 48.0% of individuals fall into the older class. Having observed the statistics on previous work experience, it would be reasonable to assume that most of these individuals have exhibited a prior labour force attachment.

Thus it may be that the need for employment-related services or assistance for young people is greater among certain groups while, for all groups, services designed to meet the employment needs of older persons is a pre-eminent concern. A disaggregation of the older group further reveals that, for six groups, over forty percent of constituents fall between 55-65 years. These groups are: neoplasm (64.8%), cardiovascular (64.4%), sight impaired (50.4%), hearing impaired (45.3%), endo-meta-nutr. (44.9%), and respiratory (41.0%).

With regard to part-time vs. full-time employment, two intervening variables preclude making the assumption that disability type acts on basis of employment. They are age and sex. All of the disability groups cited in the preceeding paragraph are predominantly older.¹⁶ Previous findings have indicated that the incidence of part-time employment increases with age and is higher among women. Self-perception of severity of disability may also be an (unexplored) factor.

4. DEMAND FOR EMPLOYMENT OR EMPLOYMENT-RELATED SERVICES

The notation of a high level of unemployment in association with a particular group, such as the physically handicapped:

- o suggests that the employment-related needs of that group are not being met; and
- o prompts a call for government intervention.

From The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario and complementary studies performed for OMC, it is possible to accurately determine:

- o the extent of interest in employment among the unemployed disabled;
- o interest in job training;
- o type of job training requested; and
- o the placement of employment-related needs among a hierarchy of need categories.¹⁷

4.1 Extent of Interest in Employment Among the Unemployed

Nearly two-thirds of the unemployed are interested in a job. This represents 29,490 people. As a result of the older age demographic, 61% of persons indicating interest are over forty. Similarly, of disinterested persons, 68% are over fifty.

An inside look at the three standard age groups reveals that 91.2% of unemployed 15-24 year olds would like a job; 73.6% of those 25-44 are interested in employment; 50.3% of unemployed persons between 45 and 64 would like to work thus confirming speculation surrounding diminished interest in employment.

When explored by primary disability group classification, those who are more interested in a job than not were found to have respiratory, musculoskeletal, sight and hearing impairments. Groups where disinterested predominates are neoplasm, alimentary, cardiovascular, and endo-meta-nutr. Again, these are groups in which older persons predominate.

Neoplasm and alimentary disability groups previously displayed unemployment rate above the aggregate handicapped unemployment rate. The finding that disinterest in employment predominates in both groups indicates that in these two instances, recorded levels of unemployment are actually substantially inflated.

4.2 Interest in Job Training, and Type of Job Training Requested Among the Unemployed.

Over half (63.6%) of the unemployed indicated either a lack of interest (55.4%) or a certain ambiguity (8.2%) regarding the prospect of job training. Approximately 13,311 persons felt that such training would be beneficial.

Of those requesting training, just under two-thirds favoured training in manual skills. Job seeking skills ranked second.

When the unemployed who declined job training were asked to specify why, 46.3% cited health problems. The extent to which health problems interfere in a person's inclination/ability to pursue training may be indicative of his/her inclination or ability to pursue competitive employment. In order of selection (all under 10%) the following other reasons for refusal were cited: no special reason; mobility difficulties; tried - didn't help; don't know where; and not available. Nearly one-third identified other (unspecified reasons).

Some employed persons and non-labour force participants indicated a desire for additional training as well. Due to the community age demographic, the greatest number of persons requesting training are in the 41-65 year age range followed by those between the ages of 18 and 40.

Looking within these two age categories however, only 12.4% of the older group compared to 33.9% of the younger age group would appreciate further training. Of those seventeen and under, one-third requested additional training. (This finding is not surprising as constituents of this age group may not have completed their basic education).

4.3 Major Areas of Need as Identified by the Physically Handicapped Community

Out of a listing of seventeen need areas, 'assistance in finding a job' ranked eleventh followed by 'finding a job training program' which ranked fourteenth. 'Alleviation of discrimination by the public' (which ranked twelfth) and 'school or educational programs' (fifteenth) may be indirectly related to employment and should be considered. In any event, employment-related needs do not enjoy a prominent placement in the overall needs hierarchy.

4.4 Job Placement and the Employed

Social or government organizations were credited with assistance in obtaining a job by 2.1% of employed persons. Private placement agencies were identified as having been helpful by 1.1%.

The majority (72.8%) attribute their own skills with winning them employment while some (4.9%) appaude positive employer attitudes.

A greater proportion of the unemployed in contrast to the employed indicated that they had experienced discrimination by employers suggesting that the absence of positive employer attitudes is more keenly felt by those who remain unemployed.

4.5 SUMMARY

Two-thirds of the unemployed disabled expressed an interest in immediate employment. Interest in employment was keenest within the 15-24 year age group and declined steadily with increasing age. An exploration of interest by disability group revealed that: (i) levels of interest varied; (ii) unemployment rates for certain groups (neoplasm and alimentary) may be overstated.

Slightly over 13,000 of the unemployed felt that job training could enable them to find employment. Almost two-thirds of the unemployed group declined the suggestion -- the majority citing health problems as preventing them from pursuing training. Manual skills training was the preferred option while training in job seeking skills ranked a distant second. Level of interest in training roughly parallels level of interest in employment when age categories are examined.

Within the larger handicapped community, direct and indirect employment-related needs ranked low in the needs hierarchy. Their placement may be expected to rise if considered with respect to labour force participants only.

Positive employer attitudes and government support efforts were not widely credited with facilitating employment. Most employed persons expressed a reliance on their own skills and abilities.

FOOTNOTES

1. For statistical support, see Appendix II: Tables 1-15.
2. See: Appendix II, Table 29.

As a point of reference approximately twenty-one percent of Ontario's total population 15 years and over possesses a grade school education. Another 52.9% have gone on to high school. The remaining 26.1% have pursued or completed some type of post-secondary education. A rough comparison to the handicapped indicates that greater proportions of people from the disabled community may be found to possess public school education only (21% vs. 36.6%) while fewer are in possession of secondary (26.1% vs. 14.9%) levels of educational attainment.

This may be an inaccurate comparison as Statistics Canada figures are based on populations over 15 years of age whereas handicapped tallies include all ages. Proportions of persons under fifteen within the disabled community are, however, small.

3. It should be noted that due to the broad income category steps employed in the 'Survey' an inflationary tendency has been introduced. Actual incomes may, indeed, gravitate toward the lower end of a given income range. Also, income may not be an accurate measure of financial hardship or ease. Family obligations or extraordinary (medical) costs may intervene.
4. For a more extensive list of specific impairments see: Appendix I.
5. The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario, Volume IV: Data Analysis, p. 60 and 63. (Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Health)
6. The incidence of physical disability in Ontario is compared to that in other jurisdictions in 'Comparative Statistics on Selected Handicapped Populations: Canada, California, the United States', OMC, 1981.
7. The participation rate represents the number of individuals declaring active labour force attachment as a percentage of the (group) population.

The unemployment rate is the percentage of unemployed persons within the labour force.
8. Statistical documentation is provided in Appendix II: Tables 16-43. Due to questions surrounding statistical reliability, introduced by anticipated diminished cell sizes, certain useful multivariate cross-tabulations were not possible.
9. At least part of: trade school, community college, or university degrees.

10. Over 33% of those unemployed have only up to grade 8, whereas 24% of the employed stopped at this educational level. The relationship is less noticeable among those obtaining up to a grade 13 education. 72.7% of the employed and 78% of the unemployed have pursued their education to a secondary school level. It must be remembered that age intervenes. The older age group was found to have a lower level of educational attainment and a higher unemployment rate than the 25-44 year age group. Unfortunately, questions surrounding statistical reliability precluded a multivariate cross-tabulation which would have explored the effect of age and education (together) on employment status.
11. Sociodemographics and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario: Volume IV, Data Analysis, p. 91 & 96.
12. Statistical support is located in Appendix II: Tables 44-49.
13. The degenerative aspect of neoplasms may contribute to the unemployment level for persons afflicted with these conditions. Another intervening variable may be age -- 64.8% of persons comprising this group are between 55 and 65 years of age. (Another 23.5% are over 45). Other groups where greater than fifty percent of constituents of working age are located in the older age category are cardiovascular and the sight impaired.
14. The total score of 62.2% may be skewed somewhat by the high participation rate recorded by the musculoskeletal group. Conversely, the low score submitted by the neoplasm group may result in a downward 'tug'. The participation rate surpassing these two groups, rests at 57.8%.
15. Due to limitations with the data, employment status by age and disability group, and employment status by sex and disability group disaggregations were not possible.
16. Appendix II: Table 46. _____
17. Statistical support is located in Appendix II: Tables 50-58.

Responses of self-categorized unemployed labour force participants, not falling within the working age population, are included (approximately 900 cases). With respect to interest in job training indicators, responses of persons not identified as labour force participants are reported. These statistics are later used to estimate the extent of possible involuntary labour force exclusion.

PART II

FACTORS AFFECTING HANDICAPPED EMPLOYMENT

1. Job Barriers

Three job barriers of particular consequence to the physically handicapped community have been identified. They are: employer attitudes, work-site architectural barriers, and transportation.

1.1 Employer Attitudes

It is frequently opined that high levels of unemployment among the handicapped may be linked to employer beliefs that disabled workers:

- o cannot meet or sustain required productivity levels;
- o introduce initial and continuing extraordinary costs;
- o precipitate escalating insurance coverage costs;
- o provoke co-worker dissension.

Various studies¹ focussing on the working disabled challenge these beliefs illustrating that:

- o production levels are high;
- o quality of work is superior;
- o attendance and punctuality records are good;
- o special work arrangements or major work site modifications are not usually necessary;
- o the handicapped display better than average safety records;
- o adequately trained and properly placed disabled workers do not inflate insurance premiums;
- o disabled workers are readily accepted by other workers.

Still 2.2% (or 2,500 persons) of all handicapped Ontarians felt that they experienced discrimination during the process of either locating or maintaining a job.² This figure rises to 6.3% among the unemployed.

1.2 Work-Site Architectural Barriers

Many work areas are inaccessible or unsuited to disabled employees. Three percent of the physically disabled community identify access problems as a limitation to their employment. Of the unemployed, this figure reaches 8.6%. Of the entire group:

"Approximately 42% of the handicapped population (173,416 people) report difficulties entering buildings in their own community. The most common reasons given relate to the weight of doors, crowds of people, no railings on stairs and the distant location of parking lots from the building".³

Employment-related buildings pose difficulties for 32.5% of the disabled. Furthermore, information gathered by the Ministry of Health reveals that 5.1% of employed persons encountered environmental barriers on-the-job, 5.2% experienced problems with equipment and tools, and 0.4% felt that personal conveniences were poor.

Buildings constructed after the implementation of The Building Code Act, 1974 which are equipped with ramps, elevators and accessible toilets may even present unnecessary hazards to individuals with mobility problems such as heavily waxed or thickly carpeted floors.

The cost of suitable modifications are not always high particularly when incorporated in the original design, but modifications to an existing structure are not usually considered part of a normal business budget. The federal government has concluded that employers are unwilling to make suitable modifications unless compelled or encouraged to do so⁴.

1.3 Transportation

Transportation, both during the job search and to a regular place of employment, presents a serious problem. In About Barriers, the American Architectural and Transportation Compliance Bureau has identified this item as being a major contributing cause to handicapped unemployment.

Indeed, in Ontario 1.3% of the unemployed disabled cite transportation difficulties as a factor responsible for their employment status. Generally, 38.7% of the community felt that more information concerning available public transit services would be beneficial. A ranking of major areas of need, as disclosed by the Ministry of Health survey, finds transportation as the sixth ranked need with 30.0% (or 136,700 persons) indicating that an improvement of service would enhance their lives.

In Ontario, upward of sixty municipalities provide conventional transportation⁵. Evidence indicates that 39,300 physically disabled persons residing in the province are unable to use such transit facilities. Additionally, 3.4% of the handicapped require human assistance to be able to make use of transit while another 3.4% rely on assistive devices to do so. The most serious difficulty reported concerns 'getting on and off' (15.8%) followed by 'poor or non-existent' service (23.7%), 'getting there' (10.9%), and the location of the transit facility (3.2%). Problems with escalators affect 0.3% of the handicapped⁶.

Greater numbers report being able to use transit although with difficulty -- 15.1%, or without problems -- 46.2%. Almost one quarter of disabled citizens live in areas where transit is unavailable.

Thirty-four Ontario municipalities do provide special transportation however, even where this is provided on a long-term basis, it does not necessarily result in equal opportunity for disabled workers⁷. Service is usually restricted to regular working hours and not flexible to short-notice arrangements.

Remaining options include taxis and specially modified cars or vans.

2. Level of Aggregate Demand

Although the effect of aggregate demand on handicapped unemployment has not benefited from exhaustive study in the Ontario context, available literature suggests that, similar to other structurally disadvantaged groups, demand deficiency increases the level of unemployment among the disabled community.

Stating that the disabled are disproportionately affected by labour market changes, an American source observes that:

- o disabled job-seekers fare less well than able bodied job-seekers during periods of economic recession, and
- o this group is also negatively affected *"by structural changes which reduce the number of lower skilled, low-paying jobs to which they are disproportionately relegated"*.⁸

In support, the authors cite data collected during the 1966 and 1972 disability surveys conducted under the auspices of the U. S. Social Security Administration. They note that between the two survey dates: (1) economic growth had slowed, (2) labour force participation had increased generally and particularly among youth and women, and (3) *the percentage of severely and occupationally disabled persons who were not in the labour force moved substantially upward*. Furthermore levels of employment for this group declined by four percentage points while, in contrast, employment among the non-disabled moved upward by six percentage points.

Although it is not possible to observe handicapped labour force patterns over the same period, participation rates recorded by youth and women in Ontario have increased in the last decade (1970-1980). If a causal relationship between enhanced labour force participation by other groups and handicapped unemployment or labour force withdrawal does exist, as speculated upon in the United States, a result -- similar to that noted south of the border -- may be assumed to have occurred in the Ontario context.

Looking at the disabled group, the American authors partially attribute a significant (14%) increase in the number assessing themselves to be unable to work regularly or not at all to a *"marked decline in availability of regular work"*. Such a shift in self-assessment might also be indicative of the "discouraged workers" syndrome. As noted in the 'Youth Employment Paper', the presence of this effect may lead to an understatement of the unemployment rates of a specific group.

3. Worker Substitution

A relationship between levels of aggregate demand generally and handicapped employment status has been observed. This, in tandem with employer reluctance to hire the disabled, is likely to result in downward pressure on job opportunities for the handicapped during periods of influx of able-bodied persons into the labour force.

As noted in the staff paper 'Youth Employment In Ontario: 1980-1985',¹⁰ such an influx is anticipated to continue -- brought about by:

- o greater increases in female participation;
- o expansion of the prime age labour force;
- o greater availability of older workers.¹¹

4. Wage Fixing, Wage Permits

With regard to youth, the case has been argued that labour market interventions, which determine a specific minimum wage, adversely affect employment. While there is an absence of literature on this subject as it pertains to the disabled, employer concern over the productivity of this group introduces the question of minimum wage or standard pay scale as a deterrent to handicapped employment.

Although the province does issue wage permits which exempt the employer from paying minimum wage to signateur workers only 89 permits had been issued to private businesses providing competitive employment in 1980.¹² It would appear that:

- o employers are generally unaware of the existence of wage permits;
- o the criteria used to award wage permits is inappropriate;
- o employers are reluctant to hire the disabled regardless of the availability of wage exemptions;
- o 'other' - employee resistance is present;
- o wage permits are distasteful to handicapped workers who consider themselves to be/and are fully productive workers.

A recent study conducted for the Ontario Handicapped Employment Program endorses the procedural aspects of issuing such permits thus eliminating this reason as a deterrent to their widespread use. In any event, it is doubtful that unemployment rates have been significantly reduced by wage exemptions.

5. Preparation for Labour Market Entry

Higher levels of unemployment among the young disabled (and among disabled women) suggest that, as is the case generally, the following factors affect employment status:

- o lack of familiarity with the dynamics of the labour market;
- o lack of occupational skills;
- o lack of work experience.

6. SUMMARY

A variety of factors -- economic, attitudinal, personal and disability - specific, interact to affect:

- o available employment opportunities;
- o the ability of handicapped workers to take advantage of available opportunities;
- o the level of unemployment experienced by the physically handicapped.

While an economic upturn may result in increased job opportunities and lower levels of unemployment generally, certain segments of the disabled labour force (due to logistical barriers, inadequate preparation, or negative attitudes directed toward disability) will continue to face difficulty in gaining or maintaining employment.

FOOTNOTES

1. Such studies include:

Nathenson, Robert B., Ideas for Action, The Harvard Business Review, May-June 1977.

"Du Pont Article". Article reprinted by California Governor's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped, May 1974.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Report on the Employability of the Handicapped, 1975.
2. The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario: Volume IV, Data Analysis p.92 & 99. Also see Appendix II: Table 61.
3. Ibid, p. 83
4. Canadian Employment and Immigration Commission, Access to Employment for the Physically Disabled in the Private Sector, Ottawa. (Information copy of draft submission).
5. Source: Office of the Provincial Rehabilitation Co-ordinator.
6. Volume IV: Data Analysis, p. 103-105.
7. Ministry of Transportation and Communications, Transit Office, Downsview.
8. Levitan, S. A. etal 'Employment Problems of Disabled Persons', in Monthly Labour Review, V100 (3) 1977 p. 8.
9. Klein, J. V. Technological Change and Employment Opportunities for Disabled Persons, p. 25.
10. 'Youth Employment in Ontario, The Ontario Manpower Commission p. 22.
11. Subject to retirement age extensions and the inability of pensions to keep pace with inflation.
12. Wage Permits for Handicapped Employees. Prepared for the Handicapped Employment Program by Abt Associates, December 1980, p. 3.
13. The Ontario Manpower Commission, Youth Employment in Ontario, p. 27.

PART III

HANDICAPPED EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK: 1981-1986

1. DEMOGRAPHIC OUTLOOK - GENERAL DIMENSIONS OF THE HANDICAPPED COMMUNITY

By the year 2001, the handicapped population is expected to increase by 41.5% to 747,153 persons or 7.6% of Ontario's total population¹. This latter figure represents a 2.2% increase over the next twenty years in the percentage of Ontario's population that is physically handicapped.

The age profile of the physically disabled is also expected to change with greater numbers of older persons becoming evident. Also,

"The disability profile will change over the forecast period. Those types of impairments which tend to afflict older people will increase most, both in absolute number and in the percentage of the disabled population for which they account"².

Consequently, sight impairments, cardiovascular impairments and hearing impairments will become more prevalent.

Within the handicapped community, the percentage of working age constituents will decline slightly while real numbers may be anticipated to move upward³. If a 62.2% participation rate is assumed to continue, the disabled labour force should number 229,002 by 2001. This represents an increase in labour force size of 42.6%. Expressed as a percentage of the estimated labour force (4,110,000)⁴, the number of handicapped workers will constitute 5.8% of the provincial workers.

2. Occupational Areas

In order of predominance, persons in semi -, and skilled trades (17.1%), clerical occupations (13.7%), service occupations (14.9%) and manual labour occupations (8.2%) account for greater than half of the handicapped labour force⁵.

A previous staff report, presenting a range of growth scenarios, has predicted that total employment in Ontario between 1980 and 1985 will increase more slowly than in the previous decade. However, even in face of this event: (i) shortfalls of white and blue collar workers; and (ii) and substantial growth in the trade and service sectors, are anticipated⁶. Such developments could be beneficial to disabled persons maintaining occupational attachments in the appropriate areas.

3. Economic Conditions

Economic uncertainties coupled with the absence of historical data exploring the relationship between economic conditions and handicapped unemployment in Ontario make it difficult to quantify unemployment forecasts. One observer has, however, noted that:

*"the disadvantaged are usually the last to be hired and the first to receive layoff notices. Handicapped workers' jobs are particularly sensitive to the state of the economy"*⁷.

American observers were found to concur noting that, during periods of economic recession, handicapped participation in the labour force declined⁸.

The tendency to withdraw from the labour force may further complicate attempts to forecast unemployment levels.

4. The Impact of Technology

Applications of advanced or specialized technology retain the capacity to either enhance or jeopardize the employment prospects of the disabled.

Job Opportunities

Applications of advanced technology are both creating new job opportunities and altering the way in which traditional jobs may be performed.

"Technological change, by substituting mechanical (effort) for human physical effort, has meant that not as many jobs are automatically precluded for those with disabilities ... more jobs have been brought within the potential purview of the disabled" ⁹.

Computer based products may be used to enhance employment opportunities by modifying standard equipment thus facilitating its use by the sensory impaired (e.g. the 'Talking Word Processor'). Also telecommunications linkages, which make employment from the home possible, possess the potential to introduce mobility-restricted persons to labour force activity.

Occupational growth sectors where the handicapped may be readily integrated include the fields of: telecommunications, information management, word processing, and computer programming¹⁰. Departments of Vocational Rehabilitation (HEW) in the U. S. have initiated 'Projects with Industry' to train handicapped persons in various of these areas. Certain projects have experienced a 95% placement rate¹¹.

Displacement

General labour displacement, thought to accompany the commercial usage of microelectronics technology, if realized, will also result in the displacement of handicapped workers¹². Previous sections have noted the effects of aggregate demand for on the employment status of the physically disabled. Reductions in demand brought about by the substitution of technology for labour may be expected to inflate unemployment levels within the handicapped community particularly for those persons with a record of employment in routinized occupations.

Specialized Technology

Finally, bioengineering technologies may be applied to enhance the quality of life and work potential of individual handicapped persons. A report prepared for the (American) National Science Foundation by the U. S. Urban Institute notes handicapped unemployment rates and opines that:

"the adaptation of technology for handicapped individuals has been hampered by a scarcity of people trained and educated in the application of engineering principles to the handicapped" ¹³.

The authors cite a previous Urban Institute study (The Comprehensive Services Needs Study) which demonstrated that the disabled community has benefited less than the non-disabled population from higher wages and other labour market improvements consequent of technology advances.

5. Education and Special Training Needs

An earlier section noted the effects of level and type of education on employment status. The significance of this variable is likely to be heightened as: (i) educational level continues to be "used as a proxy for the individual's potential productivity"¹⁴;

(ii) greater numbers of new workers, in possession of higher levels of education, enter the labour force¹⁵;

(iii) the tendency for better educated persons to assume jobs that formerly would have been filled by those with less education becomes more pronounced¹⁶.

This, coupled with comparatively higher unemployment rates within the handicapped community emphasizes the importance of effective career counselling (re: the selection of an occupational field), and adequate preparation for work entry or re-entry. Particular attention to the needs of those disabled from birth, or experiencing onset prior to forging a labour force attachment, is indicated¹⁷. Indeed, while agreeing that the handicapped need as much training or education as possible in the unequal competition for jobs, the Assistant Director of the Western Institute for the Deaf maintains that *"there seems to be little preparation in the school system to help (our clients) become responsible members of the work force"*.¹⁸

The training needs of the greater handicapped population were identified from information contained in The Sociodemographic Survey.¹⁹

Fewer than 5% of all handicapped people commented that it had been necessary for them to engage in special training in order to prepare for employment. A slightly higher proportion of the unemployed indicated a previous need for special training than those who were employed (11.7% vs. 6.9% respectively). Approximately two-thirds of those who indicated that no special training had been required were in the 'other' category which is most likely characterized by people who do not consider themselves to be actively seeking employment.

Twelve percent of handicapped people (52,700 persons) identified a need for further training or education which they would now like to take. Comparing requests for further training of the unemployed to requests among the employed, it becomes evident that nearly twice as many unemployed would like to have further training than the employed (33.0% to 17.6%). Within the unemployed population, 67% did not feel a need for further training or education. This may indicate that these people feel they have sufficient training and education but are unable to find suitable employment. A possible indicator of involuntary labour force exclusion is the 6.5% of persons in the 'other' category who expressed an interest in further training or education.

Respondents who indicated a need for further training or education were asked to specify the subject area of study. Of those with a clearly identified choice, 24.1% selected Community College (Arts) while 20.1% selected technical or trade programs. Community College (Science) also scored well (7.1%). When the relationship between type of training desired and employment status was explored, the employed population ranked B.A.'s, M.A.'s and Law as their specific area of interest more often than the unemployed who favoured technical/trade schools and arts programs in community colleges.

People with neurological, respiratory, musculoskeletal, alimentary and hearing impairments prevail in a wish to have further training from those who do not. This finding appears to support previous findings especially for people with respiratory and musculoskeletal disabilities who are prevalent in the unemployed group and who indicated an interest in a job.

6. SUMMARY

Disabled workers maintaining occupational attainments in the trade and service sectors or in white collar occupations where supply shortages are anticipated, should experience an increase in job opportunities available to them.

In spite of predicted general labour force displacement, applications of advanced technology should benefit the physically handicapped in two respects:

- (i) *modification of the work environment ("substituting mechanical effort for physical effort");*
- (ii) *enhancement of bioengineering technologies.*

Finally, education and training continue to be of importance to this group particularly in light of their observed sensitivity to the economy.

Footnotes

1. Prepared forecasts, from which the information for this section drawn, were based on a broader population than that represented by the physically handicapped target group discussed throughout this report, i.e. forecasts included impaired as well as disabled persons. Projections for the disabled group only were derived by calculating:

- (1) the percentage distribution of disabled persons in the 1979-80 Ontario impaired - disabled population (55%). (It was assumed that this ratio would remain constant);
- (2) the (numerical) size of the handicapped population in a given year by determining 55% of the base number provided by the original projections;
- (3) The percentage increase in target population growth from period to period to the year 2001;
- (4) the percentage of Ontario's population experiencing disability in a given year.

The figures reported may be slightly underestimated as:

- (1) disability is associated with older age;
- (2) the population is aging.

Consequently, the ratio of disability to impairment among the impaired-disabled should shift somewhat in the direction of disability.

See Appendix II, Tables 62 and 63.

2. A Forecast Of The Impaired Population In Ontario 1980-2001. Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Health, August 1981, page 10.
3. For the purpose of this discussion working-age refers to 20-64 years.
4. Ibid, using a constant participation rate of 66.4%. A Forecast Of The Impaired Population In Ontario 1980-2001, page 9. Table F.3.
5. See Appendix II, Table 17.
6. OMC Imbalances Between Manpower Requirements and Supplies In Ontario 1980-1985, p. ix; xiv.
7. Muir M. 'Last to be hired, first to be fired - the physically handicapped worker in Canada'. Physiotherapy Canada, Vol. 30, No. 3, 1978, p. 132.

8. See: Part II: Level of Aggregate Demand
9. Klein, J. V. Technological Change and Employment Opportunities for Disabled Persons, Department of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa, 1970 p. 35.
10. Ibid. p.
11. Linthicum, S., Technical Training for the Severely Disabled, Rehabilitation Literature, V. 38, p. 373.
12. Several authors anticipate varying degrees, and durations, of labour displacement. Included are: Ed Finn, labour commentator; Zavis Zeman; M. Howard, Prof. C. A. Jecchinis; L. A. Kelley; W. K. Norris; Y. Rabeau; Prof. C. P. Thornton. See bibliography for specific references.
13. La Rocca, J. The application of Technological developments to Physically Disabled People, Washington D. C., 1978 p. 66.
14. Klein, J. V. Technological Change and Employment Opportunities for the Disabled, p. 25.
15. Youth Employment in Ontario: 1980-1985; Imbalances Between Manpower Requirements and Supplies in Ontario: 1980-1985.
16. Zsigmond, Picot, Clark, Devereaux, Out of School - Into the Labour Force, Statistics Canada, 1978.
17. Additional support for this assumption is drawn from a review of selected vocational rehabilitation client files. Approximately 40% of the clients sampled were under twenty-five years of age. Furthermore, in contrast to the larger handicapped community, the educational profile of persons coming forward for special services is inferior (See Appendix II: Tables 29-32). Also a survey of selected secondary schools, undertaken by the Office of the Provincial Rehabilitation Co-ordinator in the spring of 1981, indicates that schools do not provide enhanced counselling services to handicapped students.
18. Muir, M. 'Physiotherapy Canada', Vol. 30, No. 3, 1978, p. 133.
19. See Appendix II: Tables 29-32 and 64.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

1. Although participation rates for disabled and non-disabled populations do not differ appreciably (62.2% vs. 66.8%) levels of unemployment do. The unemployment rate for Ontario's physically disabled labour force stands at 29.7% -- approximately four times greater than that experienced generally in 1980. Prolonged periods of joblessness are common.
2. Factors found to exert a significant influence on employment status were age, sex, and type of disability. Youth and sex (female) were found to negatively affect employment status. Constituents of the neoplasm, respiratory, musculoskeletal, neurological and alimentary disability groups experience higher levels of unemployment than the 29.7% level experienced across the entire handicapped labour force.
3. Only 6.6% of the unemployed lack previous work experience. This figure represents 3,100 persons.
4. More physically disabled workers are employed on a part-time basis than non-disabled workers (19.4% vs. 13.1% respectively).
5. The handicapped labour force, like the community, is an older one.
6. Two-thirds of the unemployed disabled expressed interest in immediate employment. Interest was keenest within the 15-24 year age group and declined steadily with increasing age.

Approximately one-third of the unemployed felt that job training could enable them to find a job. Training in manual skills was preferred.

7. A variety of factors -- economic, attitudinal, personal and disability-specific, may interact to affect: (i) availability of jobs; (ii) the ability of handicapped workers to take advantage of available opportunities; (iii) levels of unemployment.
8. Education and training (supported by labour market information) continue to be of importance to this group, particularly in light of their sensitivity to the economy.

APPENDIX I

IMPAIRMENT CLASSIFICATION

Impairment Classification

Aggregate Category	Specific Impairment or Condition
Endocrine/Metabolic/	Diabetes
Nutritional	Thyroid
	All other gland Diseases
	Obesity
	Other endocrine
Neurological	Epilepsy
	MS
	CP
	Parkinson's Disease
	ATAXIAS - Other
	Pain Unspecified
	Headaches
	Nerves - Damaged
	Spinal Cord Injury
	Brain Damage
	Polio
	Other Neurological Conditions
Cardiovascular/ Arteriovascular	Congenital Cardiovascular
	Acquired Cardiovascular
	Hypertension
	Stroke
	Other Peripheral Vascular
	Blood-Related

APPENDIX I. (Cont'd)

Sight Impairment

Total Blindness - Congenital
 Partial Blindness - Congenital
 Acquired Total Blindness
 Acquired Partial Blindness
 Other Vision Related.

Hearing Impairment

Profound Deafness - Congenital
 Partial Deafness - Congenital
 Acquired Deafness - Profound
 Acquired Deafness - Partial
 Disorders of Inner Ear
 Hearing Impairments -
 Unspecified

Alimentary

Stomach
 Intestines - Both
 Liver and Gall Bladder
 Other Digestive
 Kidneys and Urogenital
 Hernia
 Other Alimentary Unspecified

Speech Impairment

Partial Congenital Speech
 Other Unspecified Speech

APPENDIX I (Cont'd)

Respiratory

Asthma

Chronic Bronchitis

Emphysema

All Allergies

Cystic Fibrosis

TB

Lung-Related

Other Respiratory

Neoplasm

All Cancers

Tumors, Cysts

Musculo-skeletal

Rheumatoid Arthritis

Degenerative Arthritis

MD

Orthopaedic Spine

Orthopaedic Limbs

Upper Amputation

Lower Amputation

Bursitis

Burns

Skin Disorders

Spina Bifida

Hydrocephalons

Cleft Palate

Other Congenital Anomalies

Other Musculo-skeletal

APPENDIX II

CHARTS AND TABLES

TABLE 1

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY: AGE BREAKDOWN

* Note that missing cases and rounding errors account for discrepancies

AGE CLASS	ESTIMATED		POPULATION HANDICAPPED (H)	SUM (I + H)	GENERAL (G) POPULATION	% OF (G) (I + H)	% OF (I) (I + H)
	IMPAIRED (I)						
0 - 4	1,965		7,860	9,825	589,000	1.67	1.17
5 - 9	12,988		8,183	21,171	603,000	3.51	2.53
10 - 14	17,136		10,795	27,931	660,000	4.23	3.34
15 - 19	17,465		13,118	30,583	781,000	3.92	3.65
0 - 19	49,554		39,956	89,510	2,633,000	3.40	10.69
20 - 24	10,371		7,605	17,976	806,000	2.23	2.15
25 - 29	13,122		9,852	22,974	750,000	3.06	2.74
30 - 34	14,796		18,417	33,213	714,000	4.65	3.97
35 - 39	16,406		15,179	31,585	579,000	5.46	3.77
20 - 39	54,695		51,053	105,748	2,849,000	3.72	12.63
40 - 44	21,056		21,404	42,460	480,000	8.85	5.07
45 - 49	19,474		25,863	45,337	460,000	9.86	5.42
50 - 54	37,100		40,386	77,486	452,000	17.14	9.26
55 - 59	37,045		60,540	97,585	439,000	22.23	11.66
60 - 64	38,222		59,777	97,999	343,000	28.57	11.71
40 - 64	152,897		207,970	360,867	2,174,000	16.60	43.11
65 - 69	39,171		59,879	99,050	293,000	33.81	11.83
70 - 74	35,626		43,160	78,786	223,000	35.33	9.41
75 - 79	20,643		28,394	49,037	157,000	31.23	5.86
80 - 84	15,200		16,310	31,510	98,000	32.15	3.76
85 +	13,047		9,533	22,630	73,000	31.00	2.70
65 +	123,637		157,326	281,013	844,000	33.30	33.57
TOTAL (T)							
ALL AGES	381,000		456,000	837,000	8,501,000	9.85	

Source: The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario,
Volume I, Executive Summary. Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Health, July 1981.

TABLE 2

SEX AND AGE DISTRIBUTIONS

AGE GROUP					ROW TOTAL
Male	1-19	20-39	40-65	65+	
	17,300	23,100	103,100	65,000	208,500
	8.3	11.1	49.4	31.2	45.8
	52.7	44.6	46.8	43.2	
Female	15,600	28,700	117,300	85,500	246,900
	6.3	11.6	47.5	34.6	54.2
	47.3	55.4	53.2	56.8	
Column	32,900	51,700	220,300	150,500	455,400
Total:	7.2	11.4	48.4	33.0	100.0

Source: op cit, Volume IV: Data Analysis

TABLE 3EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<u>Education</u>	<u>Number of Handicapped People</u>	<u>% Of Applicable Handicapped Population</u>
No schooling	4,000	0.9
Pre-school	4,600	1.0
Grade 5	33,900	7.5
Grades 5-8	131,600	29.1
Grades 9-11	130,100	28.8
Grades 12-13	80,000	17.7
Technical or trade school	17,500	3.9
Community College	22,300	4.9
University (Undergraduate)	8,700	1.9
University (Graduate)	11,500	2.5
University (Post-graduate)	7,700	1.7
Total:	451,900	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 4

MARITAL STATUS AND SEX

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Separated</u>	<u>Divorced</u>	<u>Widowed</u>	<u>Consort-law</u> <u>Union</u> <u>700</u>	<u>RQW</u> <u>Total</u> <u>207,700</u>
Male	32,100	155,700	45,00	29,00	11,800		
*(count)							
*(row %)	15.5	75.0	2.2	1.4	5.7	0.3	46.0
*(col.%)	51.1	53.4	43.1	21.5	16.5	41.1	
Female	30,800	135,900	59,00	10,00	59,800	10,00	243,800
	12.6	55.7	2.4	4.3	24.5	0.4	54.0
	48.9	46.6	56.9	78.5	83.5	58.9	
Column	62,900	291,600	104,00	133.00	716,00	16.00	451,500
Total	13.9	64.6	2.3	3.0	15.9	0.4	100.0

* The crosstabs in this report are presented in the following format:

The first figure appearing in each cell of the crosstabs represents the actual number of respondents in that group (Count).

The second number in each cell (the row percent) represents the relative percent for each cell of the row total to the right hand side. The third number in each cell (the column percent) represents the relative percent of the column total at the bottom of each column.

TABLE 5RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

<u>Relationship</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
HUSBAND	9,600	2.1
WIFE	135,200	29.7
SON	23,500	5.2
DAUGHTER	21,800	4.8
SON-IN-LAW	200	0.1
FATHER	1,100	0.2
MOTHER	6,900	1.5
FATHER-IN-LAW	1,500	0.3
MOTHER-IN-LAW	5,400	1.2
BROTHER	1,200	0.3
SISTER	800	0.2
BROTHER-IN-LAW	2,400	0.5
GRANDCHILD	300	0.1
GRANDPARENT	300	0.1
NIECE	500	0.1
UNCLE	100	0.0
FOSTER CHILD OR WARD	200	0.0
LODGER	2,300	0.5
HOUSEKEEPER	1,000	0.2
HEAD OF HOUSE	236,200	51.9
OTHER	<u>4,800</u>	<u>1.0</u>
TOTAL	455,300	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 6PERSONAL INCOME

<u>INCOME STEP</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
No Income	86,200	19.8
\$1 - 5,000	166,300	38.3
\$5,000 - 10,000	77,800	17.9
\$10,001 - 15,000	48,900	11.3
\$15,001 - 20,000	22,200	5.1
\$20,001 - 25,000	17,400	4.0
\$25,001 - 30,000	9,000	2.1
\$30,001 - 35,000	2,200	0.5
\$35,001 - 40,000	1,700	0.4
MORE THAN \$40,000	3,000	0.7
TOTAL:	434,800	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 7OTHER (FAMILY) INCOME

<u>INCOME STEP</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
No Income	108,100	26.6
\$1 - 5,000	81,400	20.1
\$5,001 - 10,000	59,200	14.6
\$10,001 - 15,000	52,700	13.0
\$15,001 - 20,000	39,600	9.8
\$20,001 - 25,000	27,400	6.8
\$25,001 - 30,000	13,500	3.3
\$30,001 - 35,000	9,400	2.3
\$35,001 - 40,000	7,100	1.7
MORE THAN \$40,000	7,400	1.8
TOTAL:	405,800	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 8

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE
HANDICAPPED IN ONTARIO

<u>REGION</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Central	175,300	38.4
East	64,400	14.1
North	42,400	9.3
South	77,700	17.0
West	<u>96,500</u>	<u>21.1</u>
Total:	456,300	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 9

RURAL/URBAN DISTRIBUTION

<u>REGION</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Rural	148,500	32.6
Urban	<u>307,700</u>	<u>67.4</u>
Total:	456,300	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 10 CAUSE OF DISABILITY

<u>CAUSE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED PEOPLE</u>	<u>% OF APPLICABLE HANDICAPPED POPULATION</u>
Birth	29,400	6.7
Illness	55,000	12.5
Getting Older	28,900	6.6
Work Accident	38,300	8.7
Home Accident	20,500	4.6
Travel Accident	18,300	4.2
Genetic-Hereditary	55,100	12.5
Environmental Cause	34,200	7.8
Cause Unknown	<u>160,700</u>	<u>36.5</u>
Total:	440,300	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 11DISABILITY IN ORDER OF PREVELANCE

<u>Condition</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Musculoskeletal	32.0	283,300
Cardiovascular	23.3	205,700
Hearing Impairment	9.1	80,500
Neurological	7.3	64,700
Respiratory	6.9	60,800
Alimentary	6.8	60,200
Endo:meta:nutr. ⁺	5.6	49,300
Sight Impairment	5.2	46,200
Neoplasm	2.6	22,800
Speech Impairment	1.3	11,400
Total Responses: -----	100.0	884,800

* This figure represents responses not numbers of cases. Respondents were encouraged to report the presence of more than one condition where applicable. Indeed 56% suffer from multiple impairments -- 10% experiencing four or more.

+ Abbreviation for 'endocrinological-metabolical-nutritional'.

Source: op cit

TABLE 12 - PRIMARY DISABILITY GROUP AND CAUSE OF IMPAIRMENT

	Birth	Illness	Getting Older	Work Accident	Home Accident	Travel Accident	Genetic Hereditary	Environ Cause	Cause Unknown	Row Total
Endo-Meta-Nutr	0	2,200 9.0 3.9	500 2.2 1.8	0	0	0	6,700 27.9 12.2	1,100 4.5 3.2	13,500 56.4 8.4	24,000 5.4
Neurological	7,100 16.2 24.0	6,200 14.3 11.3	900 2.2 3.3	2,600 6.0 6.9	3,000 7.0 14.9	3,300 7.5 17.8	3,200 7.4 5.8	500 1.2 1.6	16,600 38.2 10.3	43,500 9.9
Cardiovascular	2,700 2.4 9.1	20,400 18.7 37.1	9,400 8.6 32.6	1,600 1.5 4.3	1,300 1.2 6.2	1,600 1.5 8.7	16,200 14.9 29.5	12,300 11.2 35.8	43,800 40.1 27.2	109,300 24.8
Respiratory	3,000 9.7 10.2	4,400 14.3 8.0	300 0.8 0.9	300 1.0 0.8	200 0.8 1.2	200 0.6 1.1	6,700 21.7 12.2	5,500 18.0 16.2	10,200 33.1 6.3	30,800 7.0
Neoplasm	1,000 8.5 3.3	900 7.8 1.6	0 4.2 1.2	500 4.2 1.2	0	0	2,500 21.9 4.5	800 7.6 2.5	5,600 50.1 3.5	11,200 2.5
Musculoskeletal	5,800 4.0 19.9	9,600 6.6 17.4	9,500 6.6 32.9	29,800 20.5 77.8	13,300 9.1 64.8	11,400 7.9 62.4	12,800 8.8 23.3	6,500 4.5 19.1	46,300 31.9 28.8	145,100 33.0
Sight Impairment	2,200 10.8 7.6	2,100 10.0 3.7	4,700 23.1 16.4	1,100 5.3 2.8	2,000 9.8 9.8	900 4.5 5.1	1,800 8.9 3.3	400 2.0 1.2	5,300 25.7 3.3	20,600 4.7
Hearing Impairment	5,200 14.6 17.5	6,800 19.1 12.3	3,100 8.8 10.7	2,400 6.8 6.3	600 1.8 3.1	900 2.5 4.8	3,200 8.9 5.7	4,300 12.1 12.5	9,000 25.5 5.6	35,400 8.0
Alimentary	1,600 8.7 5.4	2,200 11.9 3.9	400 2.1 1.3	0 6.3 6.3	0	0	2,000 11.0 3.6	2,200 12.0 6.4	9,900 54.3 6.1	18,200 4.1
Speech Impairment	900 40.4 3.1	300 15.1 0.6	0 2.1 1.3	0 6.3 6.3	0	0	0	500 23.4 1.5	500 21.1 0.3	2,300 0.5
Column Total:	29,400 6.7	55,000 12.5	28,900 6.6	38,300 8.7	20,500 4.6	18,300 4.2	55,100 12.5	34,200 7.8	160,700 36.5	440,300 100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF MEDICAL IMPAIRMENTS
PER RESPONDENT

<u>IMPAIRMENTS</u>	<u>% OF APPLICABLE HANDICAPPED POPULATION</u>
One	43.1
Two	29.3
Three	17.5
Four	10.0
TOTAL:	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL LIMITATIONS

<u>NUMBER OF FUNCTIONAL DISABILITIES</u>	<u>NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED PEOPLE</u>	<u>% OF APPLICABLE HANDICAPPED POPULATION</u>
1	163,400	35.8
2	124,100	27.2
3	84,900	18.6
4	82,300	18.0
5	1,200	0.3
6	300	0.1
TOTAL:	456,300	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 15RESPONDENT PERCEPTION OF DEGREE OF DISABILITY

<u>DEGREE OF DISABILITY</u>	<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Mild	44602	11.4
Moderate	202377	51.9
Severe	143322	36.7
Missing	24849	missing
TOTAL	415179	100.0

Note: Due to large or fractional weights, some frequencies may be in error as much as 28.9.

Source: op cit, Preliminary Data Analysis,
February, 1981.

TABLE 16

COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO:DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIES

Category	Disabled	Non-Disabled	
		Month	Annual Averages
		Nov. '79*	1980**
(#)			
Population (15 +)	257,971	6,478,000	6,535,000
Labour Force	160,544	4,308,000	4,366,000
Employed	112,865	4,045,000	4,066,000
Unemployed	47,679	263,000	300,000
(%)			
Participation Rate	62.2	66.5	66.8
EPR†	43.8	62.4	62.2
Unemployment Rate	29.7	6.1	6.9

* The month in which the sample frame was selected.

** Annual averages (the general population) for the year during which the data on disabled persons was collected.

† Employment-population ratio

Source: (1) Data re the Physically Disabled: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario, prepared for the Ontario Manpower Commission, May 5, 1981.
 (2) Data re the Non-disabled: The Labour Force, December 1980, Cat. # 71-001, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 17

EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY OCCUPATION (DISABLED)

<u>Type of Work</u>	<u>Employment Status</u>		<u>Sectoral Labour Force *</u>
	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	
Clerical	15,600 13.9	7,700 * 16.1	23,300 14.7
Sales	10,100 9.0	4,400 9.2	14,500 9.2
Service	16,900 15.0	5,200 10.9	22,100 14.0
Farm-Fish-Mine	6,100 5.4	900 1.8	7,000 4.4
Manual Labour	9,300 8.3	7,300 15.3	16,600 10.5
Semi and Skilled Trade	19,400 17.3	7,300 15.3	26,700 17.0
Transportation	3,300 2.9	2,700 5.6	6,000 3.8
1st Level Supervisor	5,800 5.2	800 1.7	6,600 4.2
Teaching	3,600 3.2	2,600 5.4	6,200 3.9
Scientific and Technical	6,800 6.1	2,300 4.8	9,100 5.7
Social and Artistic	3,100 2.8	400 0.8	3,500 2.2
Executive Managerial	10,900 9.7	1,100 2.4	12,000 7.6
Other	1,600 1.4	3,200 6.8	4,800 3.0
Column Total:	112,800 100.0	47,600 100.0	158,400 100.0

* Estimates

Note: (i) Employed column includes persons over 65 years.

(ii) Numbers are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: (1) Employed: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Populations in Ontario, April 1981.

(2) Unemployed Percentages: Survey of Special Populations. Preliminary Data Analysis, February 1981.

(3) Estimates: Derived from Extended Data Analysis, May 1981.

TABLE 18

Comparative Unemployment Rates by Occupation, Ontario:
Disabled and Non-Disabled Labour Forces

Occupational Category	Unemployment Rate		
	Non-disabled	Disabled*	Difference
Managerial	2.3%	9.5%	+ 7.2%
Teaching	3.1	41.7	+ 38.6
Clerical	6.3	33.0	+ 26.7
Sales	5.3	30.3	+ 25.0
Service	9.5	23.5	+ 14.0
Transportation	7.2	44.7	+ 37.5

* Estimates

Source: (1) Data re: the Non-disabled: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980

(2) Data re: the Physically Disabled: Derived from Extended
Data Analysis, May 1981

TABLE 19

EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY AGE AND SEX

Group	Participation Rate			Employment-Population Ratio			Unemployment Rate		
	Non-disabled	Disabled	Difference	Non-disabled	Disabled	Difference	Non-disabled	Disabled	Difference
15-24 years	70.1%	55.9%	- 14.2%	61.4%	32.4%	- 29.0%	12.4%	42.1%	+ 29.7%
Male	73.3	51.9	- 21.4	63.9	32.3	- 31.6	12.9	37.7	+ 24.8
Female	66.8	59.5	- 7.3	58.8	32.4	- 26.4	11.9	45.6	+ 33.7
25-44 years	82.0	79.6	- 2.4	77.5	52.9	- 26.6	5.5	33.5	+ 28.0
Male	96.8	95.8	- 1.0	92.3	64.7	- 27.6	4.7	32.5	+ 27.8
Female	67.5	63.8	- 3.7	63.0	41.5	- 21.5	6.7	34.9	+ 28.2
45-64 years	68.3	49.6	- 18.7	65.5	35.2	- 30.3	4.1	28.9	+ 24.8
Male	84.1	65.8	- 21.6	84.2	50.4	- 33.8	3.6	23.4	+ 19.8
Female	50.1	27.6	- 22.5	47.6	20.8	- 26.8	4.9	48.4	+ 43.5

Source: (1) Data re: the Non-Disabled: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980(2) Data re: the Physically Disabled: Extended Data Analysis, May 1981

TABLE 20

EMPLOYMENT AND PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

BY AGE CLASS (MALES)

AGE CLASSES	TOTAL POPULATION	LABOUR FORCE TOTAL	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	PARTICIPATION RATE (%)	UNEMPLOYED RATE (%)	EMPLOYED POPULATION RATIO (%)
15 - 19	7,050	2,653	4,832	1,580	37.6	40.4	22.4
20 - 24	2,263	2,179	1,429	750	96.3	34.4	63.1
25 - 29	6,133	5,441	3,583	1,859	88.7	34.2	58.4
30 - 34	7,679	6,808	5,593	1,215	88.7	17.8	72.8
35 - 39	6,766*	7,538	4,690	2,848	*	37.8	*
40 - 44	9,629*	9,155	5,621	3,474	95.1	37.9	59.0
45 - 49	11,869*	10,788	8,255	2,533	90.9	23.5	69.6
50 - 54	17,751	13,832	10,212	3,621	77.9	26.2	57.5
55 - 59	26,743	19,018	56,880	4,359	71.1	22.9	54.8
60 - 64	30,059	13,242	10,431	2,811	44.1	21.2	34.7
Total	125,942*	90,655	66,112	24,543	71.9	27.1	52.5

*Missing data (refusal to give age) precludes computation or yields percentages that are probably high. Note that about 5% of respondents refused to give their age.

Source: Extended Data Analysis, May 1981

TABLE 21

EMPLOYMENT AND PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

BY AGE CLASS (FEMALES)

AGE CLASSES	TOTAL POPULATION	TOTAL	LABOUR FORCE		UNEMPLOYED	PARTICIPATION RATE (%)	UNEMPLOYED RATE (%)	EMPLOYED POPULATION RATIO (%)
			EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED				
15 - 19	5,385	2,550	6,150	1,883	667	47.4	26.2	35.0
20 - 24	4,946	3,600	1,466	3,349	2,135	72.8	59.3	29.6
25 - 29	3,205	1,874	1,019	856		58.5	45.7	31.8
30 - 34	9,779*	6,090	3,792	12,993	2,298	62.3	37.7	38.8
35 - 39	7,623*	3,923	2,790	1,133		51.5	28.9	36.6
40 - 44	10,664*	8,079	5,392	2,687		75.8	33.3	50.6
45 - 49	12,647*	6,540	5,522	1,017		51.7	15.6	43.7
50 - 54	20,532*	8,401	24,922	18,765	3,622	40.9	43.1	23.3
55 - 59	30,646*	11,606	5,680	5,925		37.9	51.1	18.5
60 - 64	26,605	4,275	2,784	1,491		16.1	34.9	10.5
Total	132,032*	56,936	35,106	21,831		43.1	38.3	26.6

*Missing data (refusal to give age) may lead to percentages that are too high. Note that approximately 5% of respondents refused to give their age.

Source: op cit

TABLE 22

EMPLOYMENT AND PARTICIPATION STATISTICS BY AGE CLASS

TOTAL (MALES AND FEMALES)

Age Classes	Total Population	Total	Labour Force	Unemployed	Participation Rate (%)	Unemployed Rate (%)	Employed Population Ratio (%)
15 - 19	12,435	5,203	3,463	1,740	41.8	33.4	27.8
20 - 24	7,209	5,779	10,982	2,885	80.2	49.9	40.2
25 - 29	9,338	7,315	4,602	2,715	78.3	37.1	49.3
30 - 34	17,458	12,898	48,908	3,513	73.9	27.2	53.8
35 - 39	14,389	11,461	7,480	3,981	79.7	34.7	52.0
40 - 44	20,293	17,234	11,073	6,161	84.2	35.7	54.6
45 - 49	24,516	17,328	13,777	3,550	70.7	20.5	56.2
50 - 54	38,283	22,233	87,702	7,243	58.1	32.6	39.2
55 - 59	57,389	30,624	20,339	10,284	53.4	33.6	35.4
60 - 64	56,664	17,517	13,215	4,302	30.9	24.6	23.3
Total :	257,974	147,591	101,218	46,374	57.2	31.4	39.2

Source: op cit

TABLE 23

COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO:
DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIES
YOUTH (15-24)

Category	Disabled	Non-disabled	
		Month	Annual Average
		Nov. '79	1980
(#)			
Population	19,644	1,616,000	1,618,000
Labour	10,982	1,100,000	1,134,000
Employed	6,358	891,000	993,000
Unemployed	4,625	119,000	141,000
(%)			
Participation Rate	55.9	68.1	70.1
EPR	32.4	60.7	61.4
Unemployment Rate	42.1	10.8	12.4

Source: (1) Data re: the Physically Disabled: Extended Data Analysis,
May 1981

(2) Data re: the Non-disabled: The Labour Force, Nov. 1979,
Cat. # 71-001, Statistics Canada
The Labour Force, Dec. 1980

TABLE 24

COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO:

DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIES

ADULT (25 +)

Category	Disabled *	Non-disabled	
		Month Nov. '79	Annual Average 1980
(#)			
Population	238,330	4,862,000	4,917,000
Labour Force	136,609	3,208,000	3,232,000
Employed	94,046	3,064,000	3,073,000
Unemployed	41,749	144,000	159,000
(%)			
Participation Rate	57.3	66.0	65.7
EPR	39.5	63.0	62.5
Unemployment Rate	30.5	4.5	4.9

Source: op cit

* Missing data (refusal to give age) yields percentages that may be high. Note that about 5% of respondents in the adult population refused to give their age.

TABLE 25

COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO
DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIES (MALES)

Category	Disabled	Non-disabled	
		Month	Annual Average
		Nov. '79	1980
(#)			
Population	125,942	3,162,000	3,189,000
Labour Force	90,655	2,513,000	2,548,000
Employed	66,112	2,386,000	2,389,000
Unemployed	24,543	127,000	159,000
(%)			
Participation Rate	71.9	79.6	79.9
EPR	52.5	75.5	74.9
*Unemployment Rate	27.1	5.0	6.2

Source: op cit

TABLE 26

COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO:DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIES (FEMALES)

Category	Disabled		Non-Disabled
		Month	Annual Average
		Nov. '79	1980
(#)			
Population (15 +)	132,032	3,316,000	3,346,000
Labour Force	56,936	1,795,000	1,818,000
Employed	35,106	1,659,000	1,677,000
Unemployed	21,831	136,000	141,000
(%)			
Participation Rate	43.1	54.1	54.3
EPR	26.6	50.0	50.1
Unemployment	38.3	7.6	7.7

Source: op cit

TABLE 27COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO:DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIESADULT MEN (25 +)

Category	Disabled	Non-Disabled	
		Month	Annual Average
		Nov. '79	1980
(#)			
Population	116,629	2,345,000	2,369,000
Labour Force	85,823	1,933,000	1,947,000
Employed	62,289	1,865,000	1,866,000
Unemployed (#)	22,720	68,000	82,000
Participation Rate	73.6	82.4	82.2
EPR	53.4	79.5	78.8
Unemployment Rate	26.5	3.5	4.2

Source: op cit

TABLE 28COMPARATIVE LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS, ONTARIO:DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED COMMUNITIESADULT WOMEN (25 +)

Category	Disabled		Non-Disabled
		Month	Annual Average
		Nov. '79	1980
(#)			
Population	121,701	2,517,000	2,548,000
Labour Force	50,786	1,275,000	1,284,000
Employed	31,757	1,200,000	1,207,000
Unemployed	19,029	75,000	77,000
(%)			
Participation Rate	41.7	50.7	50.4
EPR	26.1	47.7	47.4
Unemployment Rate	37.5	5.9	6.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 29EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

<u>Education Attained</u>	<u>Employment Status</u>			<u>Row Total</u>	
	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Other</u>		
No Schooling	200 4.4 0.2	900 21.9 1.8	2,900 73.7 1.0	4,000 0.9	
Pre-School	0	0	4,600 100 .0 1.6	4,600 1.0	
Grade 5	2,200 6.6 2.0	1,700 5.1 3.6	30,000 88.3 10.2	33,900 7.5	66.4
Grades 5-8	24,000 18.2 21.8	13,300 10.1 27.8	94,300 71.7 32.1	131,600 29.1	
Grades 9-11	34,700 26.7 31.5	13,600 10.4 28.5	81,800 62.9 27.8	130,100 28.8	
Grades 12-13	21,400 26.8 19.4	10,400 13.0 21.7	48,200 60.3 16.4	80,000 17.7	
Technical Trade School	6,400 36.8 5.9	2,100 11.9 4.4	9,000 51.2 3.0	17,500 3.9	
Community College	8,300 37.3 7.5	1,200 5.2 2.4	12,800 57.5 4.4	22,300 4.9	
University Undergraduate	3,400 38.7 3.1	1,200 13.4 2.5	4,200 47.9 1.4	8,700 1.9	
University Graduate	5,300 45.9 4.8	1,800 15.8 3.8	4,400 38.3 1.5	11,500 2.5	6.1
University Post-Graduate	4,200 54.9 3.8	1,600 21.1 3.4	1,800 24.0 0.6	7,700 1.7	
Column Total	110,100 24.4	47,700 10.6	294,100 65.1	451,900 100.0	

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population
in Ontario, prepared for the Ontario Manpower Commission,
April 1981.

TABLE 30EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND EMPLOYMENTSTATUS, ONTARIO 1980 ANNUAL AVERAGES

Education Attained	Employment Status			
	Employed	Unemployed	Inactive	Population(15 +)
	1980	1980	1980	1980
0 - 8 Years	14.7%	16.3%	33.3%	20.9%
High School	53.9	65.0	49.7	52.9
Some Post-Secondary	9.1	7.3	5.6	8.2
Post-Secondary Certificate	10.9	7.0	6.2	9.1
University Degree	11.5	4.3	4.2	8.8
Total:	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980

TABLE 31

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR
DISABLED AND NON-DISABLED GROUPS

<u>Disabled</u>		<u>Non-Disabled</u>	
Education Attained	Unemployment Rate	Education Attained	Unemployment Rate
Grade School	36.4%	Grade School	7.7%
High School	32.7%	High School	8.2%
Technical Trade School	24.7%	Some Post-Secondary	5.5%
Community College	12.6%	Post-Secondary Certificate	4.5%
University Degree (All types)	26.3%	University Degree	2.7%

Source: (1) Data re: the Physically Disabled: Derived from Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population in Ontario, April 1981.

(2) Data re: the Non-disabled: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980.

TABLE 32

EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY REASON DID NOT CONTINUEEDUCATION

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Employment Status</u>			<u>Row Total</u>
	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Other</u>	
No Special Reason	27,200 32.7 24.2	10,900 13.1 23.0	44,900 54.1 15.8	83,600 18.7 35.8
Achieved Goal	27,400 36.2 24.3	10,100 13.4 21.3	38,100 50.4 13.4	75,600 17.1
Problems - Program	0 ..	1,000 25.8 2.1	2,900 74.2 1.0	3,900 0.9
Problems - Get There	1,000 17.2 0.9	200 4.0 0.5	4,700 78.8 1.6	5,900 1.3
Had to Work	28,600 19.5 25.4	12,100 8.3 25.6	106,000 72.2 37.4	146,700 33.1
Structure of Building	0	0	200 100.0 0.1	200 0.0
Dissatisfied With Program	1,500 24.5 1.4	2,200 35.5 4.7	2,500 40.0 0.9	6,300 1.4
Financial Problems	8,700 23.4 7.7	3,100 8.3 6.5	25,500 68.3 9.0	37,300 8.4
Still in School	4,100 18.6 3.7	500 2.2 1.0	17,600 79.2 6.2	22,200 5.0
Health Problem	4,100 28.3 3.6	3,000 20.7 6.3	7,300 50.9 2.6	14,400 3.3
Married	1,000 12.2 0.9	2,100 24.9 4.5	5,300 62.9 1.9	8,500 1.9
Other	8,800 22.3 7.8	2,100 5.4 4.5	28,400 72.3 10.0	39,300 8.9
Column Total	112,500 25.4	47,500 10.7	283,500 63.9	443,400 100.0

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population in Ontario, April 1981.

TABLE 33

EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY COMMUNITY TYPE

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Community Type</u>		<u>Row Total</u>
	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Urban</u>	
Employed	33,600 *	79,200	112,900
	29.8 **	70.2	24.7
	22.6 ***	25.8	
Unemployed	14,300	33,300	47,700
	30.1	69.9	10.4
	9.6	10.8	
Other	100,600	195,100	295,700
	34.0	66.0	64.8
	67.7	63.4	
Column Total	148,600 32.6	307,700 67.4	

* All numbers presented in this table have been rounded to the nearest hundred.

** 29.8% is the ~~row~~ total representing the share of employed persons who reside in rural locales.

*** 22.6% is the column total representing the percentage of rural residents who are employed.

Source: op cit

TABLE 34PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT AMONG THE UNEMPLOYED

<u>Previous Employment</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
No	3,100	6.4
Yes	45,700	93.6
Missing	200	Missing
Not Applicable	407,200	Missing
Total:	415,179	100.0

Source: The Sociodemographic and Need-Related Characteristics of the Physically Disabled in Ontario, Volume IV: Data Analysis, July 1981.

TABLE 35LENGTH OF TIME UNEMPLOYED FORUNEMPLOYED HANDICAPPED

<u>Time</u> <u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Less than 6 months	9,708	19.9
6 - 12 months	2,970	6.1
1 - 2 years	10,396	21.3
3 - 4 "	7,898	16.2
5 - 6 "	5,935	12.1
7 years or more	11,967	24.5
Total:	48,874	100.0

Source: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario, May 1981.

TABLE 36

AVERAGE DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT
ONTARIO 1979 AND 1980

Group	Duration of Unemployment [*] Annual Averages	
	1979	1980
All groups	14.2	13.9
Men	14.2	13.9
Women	14.2	13.9
15-24 years	11.4	11.6
25-44 years	15.7	14.8
45 years and over	18.9	18.6

* Weeks

Source: (1) 1979 Data: The Labour Force, Dec. 1979

(2) 1980 Data: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980

TABLE 37FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY SEX AND AGE1980 ANNUAL AVERAGES: ONTARIO

Group	Unemployed	Employed		
	%	Full-Time %	Part-Time %	Labour Force '000's
Male (All)	6.2	87.7	6.2	2,548
15-24	12.8	67.4	19.6	601
25-44	4.7	94.5	0.9	1,172
45-plus	3.4	93.0	3.5	775
Female (All)	7.8	69.6	22.7	1,818
15-24	12.0	60.4	27.6	533
25-44	6.7	74.3	19.0	832
45-plus	4.6	71.5	23.6	453
Total (Both Sexes)	6.9	80.1	13.1	4,366
Total Disabled	29.7	50.9	19.4	157,408

Source: (1) Data re: the Non-disabled: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980

(2) Data re: the Physically Disabled: Derived from Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario, May 1981.

TABLE 38EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY PERSONAL INCOME

<u>Personal Income *</u>	<u>Employment Status</u>			<u>Row Total</u>
	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Other</u>	
No Income	1,000	10,600	74,600	86,200
	1.2	12.3	86.5	19.8
	0.9	23.2	26.5	
\$1,000	18,600	18,200	129,600	166,300
5,000	11.2	10.9	77.9	38.3
	17.4	35.1	39.7	81.0
			45.9	90.7
\$5,001	18,000	8,300	51,500	77,800
10,000	23.2	10.7	66.2	17.9
	16.8	18.1	18.3	
\$10,001	26,600	5,300	17,000	48,900
15,000	54.4	10.8	34.8	11.3
	24.9	11.5	6.0	
\$15,001	16,100	1,500	4,700	22,200
20,000	72.2	6.7	21.1	
	15.0	3.2	1.7	
\$20,001	13,700	200	3,600	17,400
25,000	78.6	1.0	20.4	4.0
	12.8	0.4	1.3	
\$25,001	6,600	1,600	900	9,000
30,000	72.5	17.4	10.1	2.1
	6.1	3.4	0.3	
\$30,001	2,000	200	0	2,200
35,000	92.1	7.9		0.5
	1.9	0.4		
\$35,001	1,700	0	00	1,700
40,000	100.0			
	1.6			
More than	2,800	0	200	3,000
\$40,000	94.1		5.9	0.7
	2.6		0.1	
Column	107,100	45,700	282,000	434,800
Total	24.6	10.5	64.9	100.0

* Broad income steps may be accompanied by an inflationary tendency. For example, it is possible that the majority of cases located in the \$5,001.00 - \$10,000.00 income bracket actually receive earnings at the lower end of this range. If broken out more finely it may be possible that 81.0% of the unemployed received a personal income of \$5,001.00 or less.

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population in Ontario, April 1981.

TABLE 39

PERSONAL INCOME BY FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND GROUP

PERSONAL INCOME		AGE CLASS											Total	(Z)
		15 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 39	40 - 44	45 - 49	50 - 54	55 - 59	60 - 64			
None	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	318	-	318	(0.6)	
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.0)	
1 - 5,000	Male	175	477	-	-	304	609	159	-	-	807	2,532	(4.7)	
	Female	-	533	-	-	-	871	699	354	470	-	2,927	(15.1)	
5,001 - 10,000	Male	260	175	577	583	485	556	608	48	236	375	3,886	(7.1)	
	Female	207	154	475	380	713	1,086	1,142	1,330	382	690	6,558	(33.7)	
10,001 - 15,000	Male	-	-	1,110	1,321	405	1,173	1,476	1,316	3,983	2,826	13,611	(25.0)	
	Female	-	-	369	1,339	892	-	888	819	1,747	830	6,884	(35.4)	
15,001 - 20,000	Male	-	205	508	1,833	1,191	890	1,378	1,377	2,877	988	11,246	(20.7)	
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	487	-	159	-	-	646	(3.3)	
20,001 - 25,000	Male	-	-	908	858	1,765	821	2,055	2,531	1,192	638	10,767	(19.8)	
	Female	-	-	-	821	-	-	110	317	348	-	1,597	(8.2)	

Table 39 (Cont'd)

PERSONAL INCOME		AGE CLASS											Total (%)
		15 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 39	40 - 44	45 - 49	50 - 54	55 - 59	60 - 64		
- 30,000	Male	-	-	161	205	-	528	573	1,715	510	2,009	5,700 (10.5)	
	Female	-	-	-	512	-	-	-	-	202	-	715 (3.8)	
30,001 - 35,000	Male	-	-	-	128	141	175	260	811	169	232	1,916 (3.5)	
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.0)	
35,000 +	Male	-	-	-	666	-	463	785	1,184	803	272	4,374 (8.0)	
	Female	-	-	-	-	110	-	-	-	-	-	110 (0.6)	
												54,350	
												19,437	

Source: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario.

Table 40(Cont'd)

Personal Income	15 - 19	10 - 13	25 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 39	40 - 44	45 - 49	50 - 54	55 - 59	60 - 64	Total
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
25,001 - 30,000											
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	128	-	128 (1.4)
30,001 - 35,000											
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
35,000 +											
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
											9,070
											14,355

Source: op cit

TABLE 41 (Cont'd)

PERSONAL INCOME

AGE CLASS

	15 - 19	20 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 39	40 - 44	45 - 49	50 - 54	55 - 59	60 - 64	Total	%
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	-	-	-	169	-	-	-	-	-	-	169 (0.9)	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	238	77	-	1,253	-	1,568 (6.4)	-
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

20,001 - 25,000

25,001 - 30,000

30,001 - 35,000

35,001 +

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Male

Female

Source: op cit

TABLE 42Type of Income By Employment Status

<u>Type of Income</u>	<u>Part Time</u>	<u>Full Time</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Total (No. of Responses in row)</u>
Public Assist. (Row %)	15,805 (19.4)	35,068 (43.1)	30,486 (37.5)	81,359
Wages and Own Bus.	30,333 (21.4)	80,362 (56.7)	30,961 (21.9)	141,656
Other Personal	15,535 (29.0)	22,699 (42.4)	15,305 (28.6)	53,539
Private Insurance	1,706 (10.1)	3,346 (19.8)	11,860 (70.1)	16,912

Cases Across are validly additive.

Cases Down contain multiple responses (i.e. in up to 4 categories)

Source: op cit

TABLE 43Sources of Income by Employment Status

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Part</u>	<u>Average Response Per Case</u>	<u>Full</u>	<u>Average Response Per Case</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Average Response Per Case</u>
Public Assist.	18,661	1.18	40,375	1.15	46,568	1.53
Wages and Own Bus.	34,174	1.13	86,434	1.08	35,144	1.14
Other Personal	19,403	1.25	24,233	1.07	16,726	1.09
Private Insurance	1,706	1.0	3,346	1.0	12,142	1.02
Total Responses	73,944		154,388		110,580	
Total Numbers	32,000		81,000		47,000	
Average Responses/ Person in Group	2.31		1.91		2.35	

Cases across are not additive in this instance.

Source: op cit

TABLE 44

EMPLOYMENT AND PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

BY DISABILITY GROUP

DISABILITY GROUP	TOTAL POPULATION	TOTAL	LABOUR FORCE EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	PARTICIPATION RATE %	UNEMPL. RATE %	EMPL./ POPUL. RATIO
Endo-Meta-Nutr.	12,951	7,525	6,164	1,361	58.1	18.1	47.6
Neurological	29,863	17,426	12,025	5,401	58.3	31.0	40.3
Cardiovascular	56,842	31,633	23,883	7,750	55.7	24.5	42.0
Respiratory	15,198	9,437	5,265	4,172	62.1	44.2	34.6
Neoplasm	7,338	1,719	508	1,211	23.4	70.4	6.9
Musculoskeletal	94,850	69,170	46,399	22,771	72.9	32.9	48.9
Sight Impair	8,518	3,992	3,002	990	46.9	24.8	35.2
Hearing Impair	20,301	9,466	7,799	1,667	46.6	17.6	38.4
Alimentary	11,141	6,871	4,795	2,076	61.7	30.2	43.0
Speech Impair	979	169*	-	169	-	-	-
Total	257,971	160,544	112,865	47,679	62.2	29.7	43.8

* Sample too small to be reliable.

Source: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario, May 1981.

TABLE 45

PERCENTAGE POINT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
DISABILITY GROUP AND GENERAL POPULATION
EMPLOYMENT AND PARTICIPATION STATISTICS

1980

Group	Percentage Point Difference		
	Participation Rate	EPR	Unemployment Rate
General Population (Totals)	66.8	62.2	6.9
Disability Group (Differences)			
Endo-Meto-Nutr.	- 8.7	- 14.6	+ 11.2
Neurological	- 8.5	- 21.9	+ 24.1
Cardiovascular	- 11.1	- 20.2	+ 17.6
Respiratory	- 4.7	- 27.6	+ 37.3
Neoplasm	- 43.4	- 55.3	+ 63.5
Musculoskeletal	+ 6.1	- 13.3	+ 26.0
Sight Impair	- 19.9	- 27.0	+ 17.9
Hearing Impair	- 20.2	- 23.8	+ 10.7
Alimentary	- 5.1	- 19.2	+ 23.3
Speech Impair	---	---	---
Total	- 4.6	- 18.4	+ 22.8

Source: (1) Data re: the Non-disabled: The Labour Force, Dec. 1980.

(2) Data re: the Physically Disabled: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario, May 1981.

DISABILITY GROUP BY AGE GROUP FOR ALL HANDICAPPED

PERSONS BETWEEN 15 AND 65

	15-25	25-35	35-45	45-55	55-65	Total
Endo-Meta-Nutr.	499	1,332	1,133	4,171	5,816	12,951
(row %)	(3.8)	(10.3)	(8.7)	(32.2)	(44.9)	
Neurological	4,967	5,640	4,861	7,024	7,371	29,863
(row %)	(16.6)	(18.9)	(16.3)	(23.5)	(24.7)	
Cardiovascular	671	1,046	4,114	14,408	36,603	56,842
(row %)	(1.2)	(1.8)	(7.2)	(25.3)	(64.4)	
Respiratory	2,924	749	2,090	3,203	6,224	15,190
(row %)	(19.2)	(4.9)	(13.8)	(21.1)	(41.0)	
Neoplasm	136	234	489	1,723	4,756	7,338
(row %)	(1.9)	(3.2)	(6.7)	(23.5)	(64.8)	
Musculoskeletal	5,243	12,491	17,789	24,208	35,119	94,850
(row %)	(5.5)	(13.2)	(18.8)	(25.5)	(37.0)	
Sight Impaired	1,588	835	533	1,266	4,296	8,518
(row %)	(18.6)	(9.8)	(6.3)	(14.9)	(50.4)	
Hearing Impaired	2,527	2,977	2,003	3,599	9,195	20,301
(row %)	(12.4)	(14.7)	(9.9)	(17.7)	(45.3)	
Alimentary	1,089	941	1,669	3,195	4,247	11,141
(row %)	(9.8)	(8.4)	(15.0)	(28.7)	(38.1)	
Speech Impaired	0	551	0	0	428	979
(row %)	-	-	-	-	-	
						257,973

Source: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force, May 1981.

TABLE 47

DISABILITY GROUP BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<u>Disability Group</u>	<u>Employed</u>			<u>Total Labour Force</u>
	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Full-Time</u>	
1. Endo-Meta-Nutr. (row %)	1,361 (18.1)	2,494 (33.2)	3,670 (48.8)	7,525
2. Neurological (row %)	5,401 (31.0)	3,348 (19.2)	8,677 (49.8)	17,426
3. Cardiovascular (row %)	7,750 (24.5)	6,700 (21.2)	17,183 (54.3)	31,633
4. Respiratory (row %)	4,172 (44.2)	2,561 (27.1)	2,704 (28.6)	9,437
5. Neoplasm (row %)	1,211 (70.4)	- -	508 (29.6)	1,719
6. Musculoskeletal (row %)	22,771 (32.9)	11,530 (16.7)	34,869 (50.4)	69,170
7. Sight Impair (row %)	990 (24.8)	770 (19.4)	2,226 (55.8)	3,992
8. Hearing Impair (row %)	1,667 (17.6)	1,615 (17.1)	6,184 (65.3)	9,466
9. Alimentary (row %)	2,076 (30.2)	1,457 (21.2)	3,338 (48.6)	6,871
10. Speech Impair (row %)	169 (100.0)	-	-	169
Total:	47,568	30,481	79,359	157,408

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population in Ontario, April 1981.

TABLE 48

DISABILITY GROUP BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF
EMPLOYED LABOUR FORCE

<u>Disability Group</u>	<u>Employment Status</u>		<u>Employed Labour</u>
	<u>Part-time</u>	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Force</u>
	%	%	#
1. Endo-Meta-Nutr.	40.5	59.5	6,164
2. Neurological	27.8	72.2	12,025
3. Cardiovascular	28.1	71.9	23,883
4. Respiratory	48.6	51.4	5,265
5. Neoplasm	0.0	100.0	508
6. Musculoskeletal	24.8	75.2	46,399
7. Sight Impair	25.7	74.3	2,996
8. Hearing Impair	20.7	79.3	7,799
9. Alimentary	30.4	69.6	4,795
10. Speech Impair	--	--	--
			109,834

Source: Derived from -- Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population in Ontario, April 1981.

TABLE 49

DOD Scale Broken Down by
Employment Status

<u>Employment</u> <u>Status</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>n</u>
Part-Time	22.24	4.99	15452
Full-Time	21.26	4.22	67005
Student	22.60	6.30	24159
Homemaker	21.70	4.16	81161
Retired	22.52	5.06	136095
Unemployed	27.30	6.58	31358
Multiply Response	23.36	5.47	57758

* Pre-schoolers not reported due to small cell sizes.

Source: Survey of Special Populations:
Preliminary Data Analysis, Feb. 1981.

S.D. Standard Deviation

n. Number of cases

TABLE 50

PRIMARY DISABILITY GROUP BY INTEREST IN JOB
AMONG THE UNEMPLOYED

<u>Primary Disability Group</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
Endo-Meta-Nutr	800 54.2 4.6	700 45.8 2.4	1,500 3.3
Neurological	2,600 48.8 14.4	2,800 51.2 9.4	5,400 11.3
Cardiovascular	4,900 65.1 26.6	2,600 34.9 8.9	7,500 15.7
Respiratory	300 6.6 1.4	3,600 93.4 12.3	3,900 8.1
Neoplasm	900 71.0 4.7	400 29.0 1.2	1,300 2.5
Musculoskeletal	6,500 28.1 35.5	16,600 71.9 56.3	23,100 48.3
Sight impairment	200 20.7 1.1	800 79.3 2.7	1,000 2.1
Hearing impairment	500 27.9 2.5	1,200 72.1 4.1	1,700 3.5
Alimentary	1,700 71.6 9.1	700 28.4 2.2	2,300 4.9
Speech impairment	0	200 100.0 0.6	200 0.4
Column total	18,300 38.3	29,500 61.7	47,800 100.0

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped
Population in Ontario, April 1981

TABLE 51AGE GROUP BY INTEREST IN A JOB AMONG THE UNEMPLOYED

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
15-24	407 8.8	4,217 91.2	4,624 100
25-44	4,234 26.4	11,726 73.6	15,960 100
45-64	12,878 49.7	13,036 50.3	25,914 100

Source: Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force, May 1981

TABLE 52JOB TRAINING DESIRED AMONG THE UNEMPLOYED

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Handicapped People</u>	<u>% of Applicable Handicapped Population</u>
No	26,700	56.4 7.9
Yes	17,000	35.8
Missing	1,200	Missing
Total:	44,900	100.0

Source: The Sociodemographic and Need-Related Characteristics of the Physically Disabled in Ontario, Volume IV: Data Analysis, July 1981.

TABLE 53TYPE OF JOB TRAINING REQUIRED

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Handicapped People</u>	<u>% of Applicable Handicapped Population</u>
Manual Skills	11,900	64.4
Self-Help Skills	300	1.6
Social Skills	1,100	5.9
Job-Seeking Skills	1,400	7.6
None	900	4.9
Other	2,900	15.7
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total:	18,500	100.0

Source: Op cit

TABLE 54REQUEST FOR FURTHER TRAINING BY AGE

<u>AGE</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
1 - 19	8,000	5,600	13,600
	58.8	41.2	3.2
	2.1	10.6	
20 - 39	32,800	16,200	49,000
	66.9	33.1	11.4
	8.7	30.7	
40 - 64	189,100	28,300	217,400
	87.0	13.0	50.8
	50.4	53.7	
65 +	145,500	2,600	148,100
	98.2	1.8	34.6
	38.8	4.9	
Total:	375,400	52,700	428,100
	87.7	12.3	100.0

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped
Population in Ontario, April 1981.

TABLE 55PRIMARY DISABILITY GROUP BY WANT FURTHER TRAINING

<u>Primary Disability Group</u>	<u>Want Further Training</u>		<u>Row Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
Endo: Meta:	21,600	1,800	23,400
Nutr.	29.1	7.9	5.5
	5.7	3.5	
Neurological	31,600	6,600	38,200
	82.6	17.4	8.9
	8.4	12.6	
Cardiovascular	101,600	8,000	109,600
	92.7	7.3	25.5
	27.0	15.1	
Respiratory	23,300	4,000	27,300
	85.3	14.7	6.4
	6.2	7.6	
Neoplasm	11,000	400	11,400
	96.2	3.8	2.7
	2.9	0.8	
Musculoskeletal	123,000	22,700	145,700
	84.4	15.6	33.9
	32.7	43.0	
Sight	19,600	1,600	21 200
Impairment	92.5	7.5	4.9
	5.2	3.0	
Hearing	29,400	4,200	33,600
Impairment	87.5	12.5	7.8
	7.8	8.0	
Alimentary	14,700	3,100	17,800
	82.6	17.4	4.2
	3.9	5.9	
Speech	600	200	800
Impairment	69.1	30.9	0.2
	0.1	0.5	
Column	376,400	52,700	429,100
Total:	87.7	12.3	100.0

Source: op cit

TABLE 56
REASON JOB TRAINING NOT WANTED

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Tried - didn't help	6.0
Don't know where	2.4
Not available	1.3
Can't get about	7.2
No special reason	7.2
Health problem	47.6
Other	28.3
Not Applicable	Missing
Total:	100.0

Source: The Sociodemographic and Need Related
Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped
in Ontario, Volume IV: Data Analysis, July 1981

TABLE 57
EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY DESIRE FOR
ADDITIONAL JOB TRAINING

<u>Employment</u> <u>Status</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
Employed	90,700 82.4 24.1	19,400 17.6 36.8	10,100 25.7
Unemployed	31,700 67.0 8.4	15,600 33.0 29.6	47,300 11.0
Other	254,000 93.5 67.5	17,700 6.5 33.6	271,700 63.3
Column Total	376,400 87.7	52,700 12.3	429,100 100.0

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped
Population in Ontario, April 1981.

TABLE 58

EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY TYPE OF FURTHER TRAINING DESIRED

<u>Type of Further Training</u>	<u>Employment Status</u>			<u>Row Total</u>
	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Other</u>	
B. A.	600	0	1,700	2,300
	27.1		72.9	4.2
	3.0		9.1	
B. Sc.	1,000	400	200	1,600
	64.8	24.9	10.2	2.9
	5.0	2.6	0.9	
B. Comm.	300	200	0	500
	60.9	39.1		1.0
	1.6	1.4		
B. Eng.	200	0	0	200
	100.0			0.4
	1.2			
Other B.A.	300	0	500	800
	43.2		56.8	1.5
	1.7		2.5	
M.A.	200	0	0	200
	100.0			0.4
	1.0			
Other Masters	500	0	0	500
	100.0			1.0
	2.5			
Law	300	0	0	300
	100.0			0.5
	1.4			
Technical-Trade School	3,700	3,800	3,300	10,800
	34.2	35.4	30.4	20.1
	18.2	25.4	18.0	
Science-Community College	2,000	700	1,100	3,800
	51.6	19.3	29.1	7.1
	9.7	4.9	6.1	
Arts-Community College	3,600	4,900	4,400	12,900
	27.7	38.2	34.1	24.1
	17.7	32.9	24.1	
Vocational Rehab.	1,000	600	700	2,300
	43.5	24.4	32.1	4.3
	4.9	3.7	4.0	
Other Courses	6,500	4,300	6,400	17,300
	37.5	25.2	37.3	32.3
	32.0	29.0	35.3	
Column Total:	20,200	15,000	18,200	53,400
	37.8	28.0	34.1	100.0

Source: Op cit

TABLE 59MAJOR NEED AREAS* OF THE HANDICAPPED RANKED

	No. of Handicapped People with this Need	% of the Handicapped Population
1. Day-to-day functioning	267,300	(58.6%)
2. Recreational/social	252,400	(55.4%)
3. Entry Into/Out of Bldgs.	191,300	(42.0%)
4. Mobility in your community	140,900	(30.9%)
5. Medical or rehab. treatment	146,300	(32.1%)
6. Transportation Services	136,700	(30.0%)
7. Income Security	128,700	(28.2%)
8. Family relationships	119,200	(26.2%)
9. Aids/devices or special equipment	101,900	(22.3%)
10. Information about available services	97,200	(21.3%)
11. Finding a job	87,800	(19.2%)
12. Discrimination by the public	58,900	(12.9%)
13. Accommodation or housing	46,800	(10.3%)
14. Finding a job training program	41,600	(9.1%)
15. School or educational programs	40,400	(8.8%)
16. Social services (counselling, homemaker, day care, etc.)	35,100	(7.7%)
17. Personal support care services i.e. nursing attendants	22,600	(5.0%)

* This is a multiple response table.

Source: The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics
of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario, Volume IV,
Data Analysis, July 1981.

TABLE 60EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY WHAT HELPED TO GET LAST JOB

<u>What Helped</u>	<u>Employed</u>
Own Skills	82,100 72.8
Positive Employer Attitude	5,500 4.9
Placement Agency	1,300 1.1
Social/Government Organization	2,400 2.1
Volunteer Assistance	11,000 9.8
Other	10,400 9.2
Column Total	112,700 100.0

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed
Handicapped Population in Ontario,
 April 1981.

TABLE 61ASKED TO LEAVE A JOB AND IMPAIRMENT CLASSIFICATION

	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
ENDO: META:	5,800	400	6,200
NUTR.	94.0	6.0	5.5
	5.7	4.1	
NEUROLOGICAL	10,700	2,000	12,700
	84.1	15.9	11.4
	10.4	22.2	
CARDIOVASCULAR	22,700	1,600	24,300
	93.4	6.6	21.8
	22.2	17.7	
RESPIRATORY	5,200	100	5,300
	98.5	1.5	4.7
	5.1	0.9	
NEOPLASM	1,300	0	1,300
	100.0		1.1
	1.2		
MUSCULOSKELETAL	42,900	3,000	45,900
	93.4	6.6	41.2
	41.9	33.6	
SIGHT IMPAIRMENT	2,600	400	3,000
	86.5	13.5	2.7
	2.5	4.5	
HEARING IMPAIRMENT	6,600	1,300	7,900
	84.0	16.0	7.0
	6.4	13.9	
ALIMENTARY	4,700	300	5,000
	94.4	5.6	4.5
	4.6	3.1	
COLUMN	102,500	9,100	111,500
TOTAL	91.9	8.1	100.0

Source: The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics
of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario, Volume IV:
Data Analysis, July 1981.

TABLE 62ESTIMATED GROWTH IN THE PROVINCIAL DISABLED POPULATION

<u>Year</u>	<u>Provincial Population</u>	<u>Disabled Population</u>	<u>% Increase In Population</u>	<u>% of Provincia Population</u>
1979-80 [*]	8,501,000	456,000	NA	5.4
1986 ⁺	9,173,190	595,597	NA	6.5
1991	9,536,287	647,923	22.7	6.8
1996 ⁺	9,814,218	699,995	33.0	7.1
2001	9,788,022	747,153	41.5 ⁺⁺	7.6

* Unadjusted

+ Projected (from adjusted figures)

++ Reported projected rate of increase (See: (2) below)

Source: (1) Unadjusted Data: The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario, Volume 1, Executive Summary.

(2) Projected Data: Derived from -- A Forecast Of The Impaired Population of Ontario 1980-2001, August 1980. Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Health.

TABLE 63ESTIMATED GROWTH IN THE DISABLED LABOUR FORCE

<u>Year</u>	<u>Handicapped Population</u>	<u>Working Age Pop. (20-64 yrs)</u> (L.F.P.R.)	<u>Handicapped Labour Force</u>	<u>Participatio Rate</u>
1979-80 [*]	456,000	257,971 (56.6)	160,544	62.2
1986 ⁺	595,597	313,720 (52.7)	195,134	"
1991 ⁺	647,923	331,155 (51.1)	205,978	"
1996 ⁺	699,995	353,430 (50.5)	219,834	"
2001 ⁺	747,153	368,170 (49.3)	229,002	"

* Unadjusted

+ Derived from projections. The figures presented in this table reflect the increasing percentage of disabled persons over retirement age. It should also be noted that a constant participation rate of 62.2% has been assumed. The reported size of the handicapped labour may be expected to increase if (i) 15-19 year olds were to be included; (ii) participation rates were to increase.

Source: op cit

TABLE 64EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY NEED FOR SPECIAL TRAINING

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Need For Special Training</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
Employed	104,800	7,800	112,600
	93.1	6.9	25.8
	25.2	38.9	
Unemployed	42,000	5,600	47,600
	88.3	11.7	10.9
	10.1	27.8	
Other	269,500	6,700	276,100
	97.6	2.4	63.3
	64.7	33.3	
Column Total	416,300	20,000	436,200
	95.4	4.6	100.0

Source: Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped
Population in Ontario, April 1981.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - PUBLICATIONS

Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, About Barriers, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, Washington.

Berkowitz, Edward D., Disability Policies and Government Programs, Prager Publishers, New York, New York, 1979.

Boyce, B. A. A Study of the Vocational Adequacy of Former Special Education Students Following High School Graduation, California State Department of Education, 1978.

Brawn, Joan C., A Hit and Miss Affair: Policies for Disabled People in Canada, Canadian Council on Social Development, Ottawa, 1977.

California Governor's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped, "Du Pont Article", Reprinted by California Governor's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped, May 1974.

Compensation Institute Handbook of Job Evaluation Design Pacific Palisades, California, 1980.

Dudek, R. A. Human Rehabilitation Techniques, a Technology Assessment (Parts A, B) Texas Technical University, 1977.

Finkelstein, Victor, Attitudes and Disabled People: Issue for Discussion, Monograph Number Five, World Rehabilitation Fund, Inc., New York, New York, 1980.

Gale, Margaret A., Peter R. Dahl, Paul F. Cook, Vocational Opportunities: Vocational Training and Placement of the Severely Handicapped, The American Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Olympus Publishing Company, Sault Lake City, 1979.

Gurstein, M. Telidon/Videotex and Special Needs Groups Canadian Videotex Consultative Committee, Ottawa, 1981.

International Labour Office Adaptation of Jobs for the Disabled, Geneva, 1973.

La Rocca, J. The Application of Technological Developments to Physically Disabled People. Washington D.C., 1978.

McLaurin, J. W. Employability Restoration Engineering Program for the Severely Handicapped, Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, 1977.

Noble, J. H. Rehabilitating the Severely Disabled: The Foreign Experience, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1978.

Office of Human Development Technology and the Handicapped: Telecommunication Services in the Rehabilitation of the Blind, Washington, 1977.

Smith, D. C. The Dual Labour Market Theory: A Canadian Perspective, Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University, 1976.

Taylor, J. C. Fragmented Office Jobs and the Computer, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, 1979.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Disabled, A Survey of State Laws To Remove Barriers, Washington, D. C., August, 1973.

University of the State of New York, Services for the Handicapped:
Linking Special Education, Occupational Education and Vocational
Rehabilitation, Albany N. Y., 1979.

Van Horn, D. Innovative Approaches to Employment of Blind Persons
through the Application of Sensory Aids Technology Proceedings:
Human Factors Society meeting 1980.

Journal/Periodical Articles

- Asher, Janet and Jules Asher, "How to Accommodate Workers in Wheelchairs," Job Safety and Health, V. 10, (4) 1976, pp. 30-35.
- Atelsek, F. How to make Job Banks work for the Handicapped, Human Needs, Oct.-Nov. 1972, pp. 17-19.
- Bischoff, P. Disabled Students/Able Workers, Journal of College Placement Summer 1978, pp. 63-66.
- Bolderson, Helen, "The Origins of the Disabled Persons Employment Quota and its Symbolic Significance," Journal of Social Policy, V. 9 (2) April 1980, pp. 169-186.
- Bowe, Frank, "Looking Beyond the Disabilities." Worklife, May 1977, pp. 13-24.
- Clutterbuck, D. Helping the Disabled pay their way, International Management V. 30 (6) 1975, pp. 34-42.
- Dolnick, M. How the Disabled Break into the Economy, Human Needs Jan. 1973 pp. 29-31.
- Dyer, Fredrick, C., "Training the Handicapped: Now it's their turn for Affirmative Action," Personnel Journal V. 55 (4) 1976, pp. 181-183.
- Dymmel, M. D. Technology in Telecommunications: its effect on labour and skills. Monthly Labour Review, V. 102 (1), 1979.
- Ellwood, P. The Rehabilitation - Industrial Complex, Journal of Rehabilitation V. 35 (2) 1969, pp. 18-21.
- Fieldstein, M. The Economics of the New Unemployment, Public Interest V. 33 Fall 1973, pp. 3-42.
- Felgen, J. H. A New View Towards Part-Timers, Administrative Management V. 40 (7) July 1979, pp. 30-31, 37.
- Fraser, R. T. Rehabilitation Job Placement Research: A Trend Perspective, Rehabilitation Literature V. 39 (9) Sept. 1978 pp. 258-264.
- Freedman, S. The Rehabilitation Center's Responsibility: Pre-Preparation and Placement, The New Outlook for the Blind V. 64 (1) 1970, pp. 1-5.
- Grills, C. M. Uncapping Handicapped Persons via Micrographics, Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science, V. 5 (4), 1979, p. 16.
- Guest, David "Failing to See Past the Disabled Label," Personnel Management August, 1979, pp. 40-45.

- Haber, L. Social Planning for Disability, Journal of Human Resources 1973, pp. 43-53.
- Hammond, N.C., New DP Consciousness: Considering the handicapped. Data Management, October 1978 pp. 31-32.
- Hines, John, "Overcoming Disabled", Personnel Management March, 1979, pp. 40-43.
- Holmes, Patty, "There are No Handicapped", Canadian Labour June 29, 1979, pp. 9-12.
- Howard, R., Brave New Workplace. Working Papers for a New Society VII (6) Nov.-Dec. 1980 p. 20-31.
- Hoye, P. In California Social Reform Starts at Home, DCARA, Oakland, California.
- Hunter, P. N. Coming Fact-to-Face With Rehabilitation, Personnel Journal V. 58 (1) Jan. 1979, pp. 41-44.
- Jackson, P. "Update on Handicapped Discrimination," Personnel Journal V. 57 (1) January, 1978, pp. 488-491.
- Jackson, R. Are We Realistic About Jobs? Special Education: Forward Trends V. 5 (1) March 1978, p. 11-13.
- Johnson, P. Hiring the Handicapped: Why more companies are beginning to look at it, Financial Times March 30, 1981, p. 30.
- Jones, M. A. A Valid Procedure for Testing the Physical Abilities of Job Applicants.
- Keith, R. D. Employment - Seeking Preparation and Activity: An experimental job placement training model for rehabilitation clients, Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin V. 2 (2), Dec. 1977, p. 159-165.
- Kelly, L. A. Preparing for the micro future. Worklife, Summer 1980, pp. 6-7.
- Kenway, A. "Overcoming Handicaps", Management Today March, 1979, pp. 54-56.
- Koch, J. Employing the Disadvantaged: Lessons from the past decade, California Management Review, V 17 (1), pp. 69-71.
- Krefting, L. A. The Impact of Applicant Ability on Evaluative Judgements in the Selection Process, Academy of Management V 19 (4), Dec. 1976, pp. 675-680.
- Kroger, W. "Disabled Workers Are No Handicap to Business, Nation's Business, May, 1979, pp. 110-114.
- Lacy, D. P. EEO Impli-ations of job analysis, Employee Relations Law Journal V 4 (4) Spring 1979, pp. 525-534.
- Levitan, S. A. "Employment Problems of Disabled Persons". Monthly Labour Review, V 100 (3) 1977 p. 8 -
- Linthicum, S. Technical Training for the Severely Disabled: A Model Rehabilitation Literature V 38 (11-12) 1977 pp. 373-375.

- Mallier, A. T. Part-time Workers and the Economy, International Journal of Manpower V 1 (2) 1970, pp. 2-7.
- Mason, M. J. Software Opens Up Jobs for Blind, Minicomputer News V 5 (8) 1977, p. 18.
- Marshall, P. "Blind Workers: A Matter of Perspective", Manpower V. 6 (7), pp. 14-20.
- Marten, H. A. Physical Handicaps No Obstacle to DPers. Computerworld V 12 (44) 1978, p. 102.
- McMahon, B. T. A Model of Vocational Redevelopment for the Midcareer Physically Disabled, Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin V 23 (1) Sept. 1977, pp. 35-47.
- McLeod, M. "Training the Handicapped in Saskatchewan", Canadian Vocational V 13 (2) August 2, 1977, pp. 26-28.
- Mellor, C. M. Technical Innovations in Braille, Reading, Writing and Production, Visual Impairment and Blindness V 73 (8) Oct. 1979, pp. 339-343.
- Milk, L. "But Can They Do The Job", Human Rights, V 9 (1) Spring 1980, pp. 16, 17, 49, 50.
- Minton, E. B. Job Placement" Strategies and Techniques, Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin V 21 (2) Dec. 1977, pp. 141-9.
- Muir, M. Last to be hired, first to be fired - the Physically Handicapped Worker in Canada, Physiotherapy Canada V 30 (3) May-June 1978, pp. 128-134.
- Nagi, S. Z. Disability Behaviour: Income Change and Motivation to Work, Industrial and Labour Relations Review V 25 (2), 1972, pp. 223-233.
- Nagi, S. Z. "Work, Employment and the Disabled", American Journal of Economics and Sociology V 31 (1) 1972, pp. 21-34.
- Nathanson, R. B. Integrating Disabled Employees into the Workplace, Personnel Journal, V 60 (2), Feb. 1981, pp. 109-13.
- Nathanson, B. "The Disabled Employee: Separating Myth From Fact," Harvard Business Review May-June 1977, pp. 9-11.
- Neil, S. Boes "Able-Disabled Battling Against Barriers", Worklife V 3 (10) October, 1978, pp. 8-11.
- Nesbitt, J. A. "Rehabilitating Employers", Parks and Recreation November 1977, pp. 36, 37, 56, 67.
- Norris, W. K. Manpower Aspects of Technological Progress. International Journal of Social Economics, v 2 (3) 1976, pp. 74-88.
- Oechslein, J. J. An Employer's Point of View: Enterprises and the Handicapped, International Labour Press Jan. 1981, pp. 8-10.

- O'Malley, M. Away From it All: How Computer Technology will let you get out of the office for good, pp. 60-66.
- Peach, L. A Realistic Approach to Employing the Disabled, Personnel Management V 13 (1) Jan. 1981, pp. 18-21.
- Pollock, H. "The Stay Program", Canadian Education V 18 (4) Winter, pp. 21-23.
- Rader, B. On Placement of Multiple Handicapped Clients into the Open Job Market, Rehabilitation Literature, V 39 (10) Oct. 1978, pp. 299-302.
- Rose, G. L. Effects of Handicap and Job Characteristics on Selection Evaluations, Personnel Psychology V 32 (2) Summer 1979, pp. 385-92.
- Rosenburg, J. The Relationship of Types of Post-High School Education to Occupation and Economic Independence of Physically Handicapped Adults, Rehabilitation Literature, V 38 (2), Feb. 1978, pp. 45-49.
- Rosher, J. H. Physically Disabled Students and Achievements Orientation: Self-Concept, Curriculum Track, and Career Aspirations, Journal of Vocational Behaviour, V 13, 1978, pp. 35-44.
- Ross, V. "Demanding Access For All", Maclean's V 94 (16), pp. 50-56.
- Ryan, S. G. Toward Computer Literacy for Visually Impaired Students, Visual Impairment and Blindness, V 72 (8) Oct. 1978, pp. 302-310.
- Salomone, P. R. Job Placement: New Tactics for Securing Job Leads, Relabilitation Counselling Bulletin, V 22 (4), April 1979, pp. 338-346.
- Schechter, E. S. Employment and Work Adjustments of the Disabled: 1972, Social Security Bulletin, V 40, pp. 2-15.
- Sloan, D. Jobs for the Disabled, Occupational Safety and Health, V 7, p. 49.
- Smith, E. I. The Employment and Functioning of the Homebound Disabled in Information Technology, The American Journal of Occupational Therapy V 27 (5) 1973, pp. 232-238.
- Sprungin, S. J. Competency Based Curriculum: A National Survey of Teachers, Visual Impairment and Blindness V 72 (5), May 1978, pp. 163-169.
- Stashower, G. Mainstreaming in the Work World, American Education V 12 (5) June 1976, pp. 9-13.
- Strassman, P. A. The Office of the Future: Information Management for the New Age. Technology Review, January 1980, p. 54-65.
- Tesolawski, D. G. Modifying Work Personalities of the Handicapped, The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, V 27 (4), June 1979, pp. 337-340.

- Thomas, T. H. Correlates and Consequences of Severe Disabilities, Journal of Occupational Medicine, V 16 (4) April 1974, pp. 234-244.
- Thornton, P. Managing the Manpower Aspects of Applying Microelectronics Technology. International Journal of Manpower, V 1 (1).
- Wadlow, E. "How DOL Helps Handicapped Workers", Worklife V 2 (5), pp. 7-12.
- Weidenbaum, M. L. Social Responsibility Is Closer Than You Think, Michigan Business Review V 25 (4), July 1973, pp. 32-35.
- Wilson, W. J. "The Disabled: An Underused Human Resource", Management Review V 63 (3) 1974, pp. 46-48.
- Wolfe, B. L. How the Disabled Fare in the Labour Market, Monthly Labour Review, V 103 (9), Sept. 1980, p. 48-52.
- Zadny, J. J. The Problem With Placement, Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin, V 22 (5) June 1979, pp. 439-42.
- _____, A survey of Job - Search-Patterns Among State Vocational Rehabilitation Clients, Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin V 22 (1) Sept. 1978, pp. 60-65.
- Beyond the Eighties. Worklife, Summer 1980, pp. 2-5.
- New Technology: The Impact on Employment. European Industrial Relations Review V 72, 1980, p. 25.
- Canada's Two Tier Social Security System, Employee Benefit Plan Review V 32 (2) August 1977, pp. 24-5.
- Job Opportunities for the Handicapped, American Federationist 1977, pp. 12-13.
- "De-Mything the Market Place", American Education V 13 (7), August/September 1977, pg. 4.

Newspaper Articles

- Lipovenko, D. Computers Open New World to Disabled, The Globe and Mail Oct. 23, 1980, p. 4.
- Maloney, R. Hamilton Agency Links Jobs and Handicapped, Ibid. March 23, 1981, p. 30.
- Probe finds blind are 'poorest of the poor' Ibid.

STUDIES

Coughlin, R. Preliminary Report on the Unemployed Handicapped Population in Ontario. Prepared for the Ontario Manpower Commission, May 1981.

Gilbert, J. W. Extended Data Analysis on the Handicapped Labour Force of Ontario. Prepared for the Ontario Manpower Commission, May 1981.

Gilbert, J. W. et al. The Sociodemographic and Need Related Characteristics of the Physically Handicapped in Ontario. Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Health, Toronto, August 1981.

Health and Welfare Canada. The Health of Canadians: Report of the Canada Health Survey. Ottawa, June 1981.

Jecchinis, C. A. The Impact of Microelectronics Technology on Employment: A Survey of Current Research Studies and Related Policies. Prepared for the Ontario Manpower Commission, Toronto, July 1980.

McWhinnie, J. A Composite Picture of the Disabled in Canada. Health and Social Policy, Health and Welfare Canada, Ottawa, 1980.

Ontario Manpower Commission, Youth Employment in Ontario 1980-1985, Toronto, June 1980.

Imbalances Between Manpower Requirements and Supplies In Ontario: 1980-1985, Toronto, 1980.

Public Health Service Vital and Health Statistics: Data from the the National Health Survey (Series 10: 126, 134, 125, 135, 111, 118), U. S. Department of HEW, Hyattsville, Maryland, 1977.

State Estimates of Disability and Utilization of Medical Services: United States 1974-6. Ibid, 1978.

Shanks, J. M. The California Disability Survey: Executive Summary, California Department of Rehabilitation, Berkeley, 1980.

Social Security Administration, Work Disability in the United States, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington D.C., December 1980.

(CANADIAN) GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Federal

Canadian Human Rights Commission, Employ-Ability; a Resource Guide, Canadian Human Rights Commission, Ottawa, 1974.

Cohen, L. Summary of the American Experience with the Federal Contract Compliance Program. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada, Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, December, 1979.

Complan Research Associates Ltd. The Affirmative Action Study. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, December, 1979.

Eastern Canada Consulting Services Ltd. Assessment of Impact of Insurance Coverage and Related Conditions As A Potential Barrier To Employment of the Physically Disabled. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, March, 1979.

Eberts, M. Mandatory Affirmative Action Legislation: A Proposal. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, December 1979.

Federal-Provincial Relations Office, Federal-Provincial Programs and Services; A Descriptive Inventory, Federal-Provincial Relations Office, Ottawa, 1978.

House of Commons, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped, Ottawa, No. 21, May 25, 1981.

House of Commons, Obstacles: Report of the Special Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped, Ottawa, February, 1981.

Kinsella, N. A Renewed Federal Contracts Program: An Instrument for Progressive Affirmative Action. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, November, 1979.

Kinsella, N. Provincial Human Rights Legislation - Affirmative Action Program. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, March 1980.

Klein, J. V. Technological Change and Employment Opportunities for Disabled Persons Department of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa, 1970.

Minister of Employment and Immigration Canada, News Release 81-17 Experimental Wage Subsidy Program.

Pamphlets: (i) Hiring The Disabled: A Guide for Employers

(ii) Employment and the Disabled.

Rabeau, Y. Tele-Informatics, Productivity and Employment: An Economic Interpretation Department of Communications contract with GAMMA, Montreal 1980.

Robertson, P. C. What Does Affirmative Action Really Mean? Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, January 1979 (Transcript of Audio-Visual).

Robertson, P. C. Affirmative Action What's It All About. Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, March 1980.

Smith, A. W. Affirmative Job Placement, Prepared for Affirmative Action Division, Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, Ottawa, March, 1980.

ONTARIO

Board of Industrial Leadership, Building Ontario in the 1980's, Board of Industrial Leadership, Toronto, January, 1981.

Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped, Fifth Annual Report, Toronto, March, 1980.

Ontario Manpower Commission, Comparative Statistics on Selected Handicapped Populations: Canada, California, the United States. Toronto, 1981.

Ontario Ministry of Labour, I Am More Than you See; A Guidebook for Employers on Hiring the Physically Handicapped, Ontario Ministry of Labour, 1978.

Ontario Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Office of the Budget and Intergovernmental Finance, Toronto, May, 1981.

Ontario Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Public Accounts 1979-80; Volume 1 - Financial Statements, Toronto, September, 1980.

Social Development Policy Field, Expenditure Estimates 1980-81. Vol. 4, Toronto, 1981.

Workmen's Compensation Board, Annual Report. Toronto, 1979.

OTHER

Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health, Evaluation of the Employment Skills Demonstration Program, Edmonton, Alberta, December, 1980.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Health, Report of the Saskatchewan Task Force on Rehabilitation, Regina, December, 1980.

